DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 572 SP 019 498

AUTHOR Beers, C. David; And Others
TITLE Policy Frameworks for Local Action. Lessons from Implementing the Teacher Corps Guidelines. Volume 2. Final Report.
INSTITUTION SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, D.C. Dissemination and Professional Development Programs.
PUB DATE Jan 82
CONTRACT 300-78-0289
NOTE 80p.; For related document, see SP 019 497.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Involvement; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Planning; Federal Programs; Guidelines; *Inservice Teacher Education; Policy Formation; Program Administration; *Program Implementation; School Districts; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This volume is directed primarily toward local Teacher Corps practitioners and is intended to serve as a companion to Volume 1 of this final report. This volume provides an additional context for the description of and assumptions about Teacher Corps project implementation. Data collected in 1980 during site visits to selected projects and descriptions provided by local documenters at other sites provide a description of three aspects of Teacher Corps program implementation. Chapter I is devoted to the establishment of a collaborative relationship between the institution of higher education and a local education agency, one of the Teacher Corps mandates. The roles of project participants and the value of the planning year in the five-year project cycle are discussed. In Chapter II, the process of involving the community in the educational process is illustrated through a case study of a Teacher Corps project. Views on the process are expressed by local project documenters and by participants in the cooperative process. The involvement of the school staff in project planning is explored in Chapter III through a case study of an actual Teacher Corps project. Attention is given to the creation of a conducive collaborative climate, the finding of training resources, and the characteristics of the planning process. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212572

SRI International

POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR LOCAL ACTION
Lessons from Implementing the Teacher Corps Guidelines

Volume 2

Final Report
Teacher Corps Implementation Study
C. David Beers, Study Director

January 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nicholas Stayrook
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by:

C. David Beers, Program Manager
Anthropological Studies in Education
Christine R. Finnan, Educational Anthropologist
Michael S. Knapp, Educational Sociologist
Dorothy E. Stewart, Research Analyst

With Assistance from:

Daniel G. Broussard
J. C. Cross
James L. Deslonde
James S. Fairweather
Richard A. Marciano
Teresa Middleton
Nicholas G. Stayrook
Mary A. Wilcox

Editorial Consultant: Klaus Krause

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Teacher Corps National Evaluation
SRI Project 7702

Nicholas G. Stayrook, Project Director
Richard A. Marciano, Former Project Director
Marian S. Stearns, Center Director
Education and Human Services Research Center

This document has been prepared under contract with the Office of Dissemination and Professional Development, USOE, Contract Number HEW-300-78-0289, Jean Narayanan, Project Monitor. The contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

SP 019 498

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION. 1

I BRINGING TOGETHER INSTITUTIONS THROUGH THE FORMATION OF A TEACHER CORPS PROJECT 3

The IHE-LEA Partnership 4
Bringing Together Training Institutions Within the Project Itself 16
The Value of the Planning Year for Encouraging Institutional Partnership 33

II INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY 35

Community Involvement in One Teacher Corps Project 35
Issues Affecting Community Involvement 40
The Community's View of Community Involvement in Teacher Corps 51
Policy Implications of Project Experience with Community Involvement in the Planning Year 53
The Value of the Planning Year for Promoting Community Involvement 55

III INVOLVING SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT 56

Planning a Teacher Training Program in Ellington School . . 56
Sources of a Climate Conducive to Planning at the School Level 64
Finding Training Resources 68
Characteristics of the Flow of Activities at the School Level 69
The Value of the Planning Year for Involving Personnel in Project Development 76

INTRODUCTION

The material in this volume was prepared during the summer and fall of 1980 as part of an interim report to the Office of Education as part of the SRI evaluation of the national Teacher Corps program. We are including this Volume 2 as a companion to our 1982 report (Volume 1) to provide additional context for the description of and assumptions about Teacher Corps project implementation.

This volume describes three different aspects of Teacher Corps program implementation. Chapter I is devoted to the process of establishing the relationship between an institution of higher education (IHE) and a local education agency (LEA), which is part of the collaborative alliance that is Teacher Corps. The value of the planning year for project operations also is discussed. Chapter II brings in another partner--the community. The process of involving the community in one site is discussed in some detail. Selection and operation of the community council are included in the discussion in this chapter, as well as views toward community involvement expressed by local documenters, community persons, and others knowledgeable about this component. Chapter III develops the story of how front-line professionals--teachers and principals in a low-income school--get involved in project planning. Again, the process in a particular site is described, supplemented by experiences in other projects that were reported by local documenters.

There are, important differences between the two volumes that should be noted. The 1980 material is presented intact in this volume, with no rewriting to reflect additional data or increased awareness of events across all Teacher Corps projects. Therefore, interpretations reported in this volume in some small ways may not always agree with those in Volume 1, which

have been based on both additional information from projects and another year of time in which to study and reflect on the implementation process.

In a sense, we were addressing a different audience in the 1980 interim report. In 1980, we were writing primarily for local practitioners, especially those inside the Teacher Corps family. The 1982 report (Volume 1) is directed primarily toward state and federal policymakers who have responsibility for the design and implementation of educational and other social intervention programs beyond Teacher Corps.

This difference in audiences for the reports led to a difference in focus also, although the methodological approach was similar for both reporting periods. For this volume, we chose to emphasize the description of the implementation process as it occurred in local projects, focusing on case data collected during site visits to a few selected projects and supplemented with descriptions provided by local documenters in other sites. The emphasis in Volume 1 is on analysis of the policy implications of the data, which are drawn largely from documentation essays from local projects. The 1980 report served as a departure point for the description and analyses reported in Volume 1. We believe that including it with our 1982 report provides additional perspective on the implementation process that will be of interest to a variety of readers.

I BRINGING TOGETHER INSTITUTIONS THROUGH THE FORMATION OF A TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

This section describes the collaboration of two institutions, the IHE and the LEA, that provide educational services indirectly to low-income students by providing training for their teachers. These institutions have historically offered two kinds of teacher training: IHEs offer preservice training to student teachers, and LEAs offer inservice training to working teachers. Working teachers seeking college credit usually attend classes on the IHE campus. Those classes are not designed for working teachers, and student teachers have little exposure to schools aside from their formal student teaching.

A goal of Teacher Corps is to remove this distinction and encourage IHEs to join LEAs in providing high-quality inservice training and to build preservice programs with a strong emphasis on field training in the schools. Teacher Corps relies on a temporary, federally funded intermediary group, the Teacher Corps project, to provide a bridge for the two institutions.

This section begins with a description of conditions existing in the IHE and the LEA that influence the success of the institutions' joint working relations. An examination of the issues that relate specifically to the formation of Teacher Corps projects follows.

The IHE-LEA Partnership

The IHE and the LEA must cross an historically defined gap of substantial magnitude to join forces in the provision of an integrated training program for the staff of low-income schools. One documenter described the situation well*:

> The difficulty in establishing an integrated teacher training program has an historical basis. There is a history of a lack of communication and cooperation between the local IHE and LEA, which is founded on the belief that the IHE and LEA are fulfilling different functions and serve different needs. This belief importantly affects the prospects for institutionalizing a cooperatively designed continuum of professional development opportunities.
>
> The IHE and LEA view their roles in teacher training as significantly different. The IHE acknowledges its role in providing a liberal arts education coupled with the basic certification requirements by this state. Changing classroom needs and changing teaching strategies have been historically slow to affect programming at the IHE. Until the state certification requirements are changed to reflect changing educational needs and strategies, there is subsequently little emphasis in pre-servicing plans for dealing with contemporary issues and problems. The responsibility of the LEA has historically been to fill this knowledge and skill gap. It becomes the LEA's responsibility to provide in-servicing at the district and building level which is responsive to these changing needs. These needs have been identified by state mandates and not by local teachers' perceived in-servicing needs. As a result the LEA has been forced to address the issues of career education, sex and drug education, multicultural education, bilingual education, leisure education, mainstreaming, and so forth. In effect, the IHE provides the teacher with a basic education and the LEA ideally provides the teacher with the knowledge which is needed to effectively operate in the real classroom.

*The excerpts from documenters' essays presented in this chapter have been edited for spelling, grammar, and punctuation.

> Locally this means that the IHE responds to the state-identified requirements for pre-servicing and the LEA responds to state-identified requirements for in-servicing without consideration for any additional or varying concerns which are present locally. Since a large percentage of IHE teacher graduates enter local school systems, there should seem to be more commitment at the IHE for meeting local educational needs. While this may be so, the historical responsibility for meeting local needs has rested with the local LEA.

This historical division of labor between IHE and LEA has consequences for the Teacher Corps Program. The documenter reflected further about the process of change at this site and the signs of progress:

> Since the IHE and LEA have historically functioned separately in teacher training, integration will not occur overnight, in one year, nor probably during the five-year Teacher Corps funding cycle. The process of cooperative decision-making coupled with the human linkages established through exchange of human and material resources have become important factors influencing local realization of this goal. The increased cooperation has already proved to be beneficial to professors, teachers, deans, consultants, and superintendents. Increased experiences of professors in the LEA and cooperative efforts by the College of Education, central office, consultants, superintendents, professors, and teachers has led to the realization of professional gains. The operation of the policy board, dean and superintendents making joint decisions concerning teacher training has led to increased communication, trust and knowledge where there has been an historical void. This is leading to a joint serious appraisal of the total professional development continuum offered locally. This renewal of awareness and quality in professional development programming is indicative of future cooperative program design and development.

Issues Affecting the Creation of the Partnership

The preceding excerpts suggest two principal reasons why IHEs and LEAs have historically worked separately in providing teacher training: they have different institutional missions and they respond to different directives. In other projects, the IHE and LEA moved closer together in their provision of teacher training through previous collaborative efforts than they did in the project cited above. However, the basic

distinction between the kind of training offered at the IHE and by the LEA still holds. The following factors influence whether a Teacher Corps project is able to bridge this historical gap between the two institutions:

- Prior collaborative experience between the two institutions.
- Resolution of control issues.
- The nature and compatibility of the two institutional structures.
- The geographical distance between the two institutions.
- Cultural differences between the IHE and LEA staff.
- The severity of retrenchment conditions affecting each institution.

Prior Collaborative Experience

The Program 78 project described above represented the first time the IHE and LEA were linked by a Teacher Corps project. They, like many other projects without prior collaborative experiences, used the planning year to lay the groundwork for understanding each other and working comfortably together. Projects found the process of relationship building time consuming but productive, as the following essay indicates:

> Even though project activities are on schedule and the staff is presently working as a unit, initially there was a considerable amount of time spent in building a relationship with the LEA administration and staff. It was understood by the staff that developing positive relationships takes time. It was not anticipated that even after the staff had been involved in staff development activities and several staff meetings had been held that the level of misunderstanding concerning project operations, parameters, and staff functions would still exist.
>
> Even though the period of trust building did cost the project a certain amount of time at the onset of the project, the staff feels that the time spent in this endeavor was very worthwhile and well spent because of the relationship that did evolve and became established as a result of staff meetings where concerns and attitudes were discussed.
>
> It was disheartening to the staff to constantly discuss the same things, but it was not futile because once the LEA

> administration understood what Teacher Corps is designed to do and that the staff is only interested in doing those things, they gave the staff their wholehearted support.

In project sites where the IHE and LEA had previously collaborated successfully, the time-consuming process of learning to work together was eliminated and program planning began directly. For example, the IHE and LEA in one case study site had been paired several years earlier to help accomplish court-ordered busing, and they also had worked together in a previous Teacher Corps cycle. The superintendent trusted the IHE-based Teacher Corps staff and did not hesitate to commit herself and her staff to the project. Through a series of monthly meetings, the Teacher Corps staff and the district staff developed close working relationships. They jointly set procedures for selecting the team leader and interns, and they helped each other in emergencies. For example, when school began after the planning year, the city superintendent called for a major change in the method of providing reading instruction in the schools. The district's reading specialist was overwhelmed with requests for help from teachers. She called on two members of the Teacher Corps staff whom she knew had experience in reading instruction, and together they developed programs for the teachers.

In a few cases, however, prior failures at collaboration left negative legacies for projects to overcome. In one case, a documenter noted the following problems that the project staff members encountered when they tried to gain entry into project schools:

> Some of the teachers stated that they worked with Teacher Corps in Cycles 9 and 11 and their problems were not addressed. Some teachers complained about institutional racism at the IHE and wondered why this institution was chosen for this project again. The staff explained that Cycles 9 and 11 of Teacher Corps were two-year projects and that these cycles did not have a planning year to include the various groups included in this cycle. Teachers were unimpressed with programs coming into schools and lasting for a couple of years.

These teachers were eventually convinced that the 5-year Teacher Corps project was worth supporting--or at least worth tolerating. Nevertheless, perceptions of the past clearly made the process of program development much more difficult.

Resolution of Control Issues

Major conflicts over control of the project have not occurred at most projects. Projects usually divide responsibility for different tasks between the institutions. IHEs are responsible for granting degrees and for paying IHE-based staff and participants, and the LEAs have taken responsibility for granting release time for teachers and providing numerous other in-kind contributions, from partial staff salaries to office and workshop facilities. Depending on the institutional affiliations of the people involved, joint control in some manner has become a reality, with more leadership emanating from the IHE in most cases because most directors are affiliated with the IHE. A documenter from an urban project wrote:

> In examining Teacher Corps projects throughout the country, most directors were chosen from the university and it consequently controls the program. However, in this city, the community was adamant about selecting a director from the LEA rather than the university. The community believed that an LEA director could be more effective in dealing with community/educational problems. A review of Teacher Corps literature indicated that when universities controlled the program, there was a failure to develop or institutionalize major comprehensive programs. Universities had difficulty in communicating with community members and generally ran the program their own way. The community component of Teacher Corps 79 in this city wanted more input into the decision-making process and felt it was important to hire someone at the LEA to try and avoid these problems and open up lines of communication.
>
> There has been a great deal of strain between the director and the IHE on who actually directs the program. It appears that the university wanted to control the IHE component while leaving the LEA component to the director. When the director came on board, the university was more than helpful in getting her established. As the director began to assume control of the program and indicated she was in charge of the project at both levels, some problems began to emerge.

> The director was told she was not in control of the Teacher Corps budget at the IHE level and that she could not technically hire anyone from the budget or sign requisitions. National Teacher Corps informed the univeristy that Washington recognized only one director and that person in this project came from the LEA. The university was also told that the director was responsible for the budget and total program.

This statement suggests that the control problem had several dimensions, reflecting a history of noncommunication and mistrust among university, the LEA, and the community. In this particular case, the community was strong enough to maintain an LEA-based project despite university pressure.

Such examples are few, however, in the overall population of Teacher Corps projects. More often, the IHE exercised the greater initiative and in a subtle way had more influence over the shape and direction of the project. A documenter from a project with an IHE-based director described a more typical pattern in which the control issue was resolved more by default than anything else:

> We are fortunate in having a dean of education who has made an enthusiastic investment in the project. The dean has served as the chair of the Policy Board and attends all its meetings. His wholehearted support of the project and promise of the university's resources have impressed persons in the LEA and community. It has indicated that the university takes the project seriously.
>
> The administrators from the LEA have not made such an open display of support. (The LEA has been assocaited with 3 cycles of the previous Teacher Corps project with another university.) The superintendent does not attend all Policy Board meetings, sending instead the federal program coordinators as representatives. He is not empowered to make decisions on policy matters, which means delays in decision-making and implementation.

Many LEAs did lobby more actively for their interests than this documenter suggests, even though the director and Teacher Corps staff were primarily IHE personnel. In one case, participants described the way in which decisions were made about the details of the program as a

"painful" process of negotiation between IHE and LEA, characterized by strong wills and differing agenda on the part of each institution.

The underlying struggle over control of the Teacher Corps project seen in this and other projects can in fact be healthy, a sign of strong commitments to training that over time may merge into a more integrated approach to the training needs of low-income schools.

Compatibility of Institutional Structures

Both IHEs and LEAs had organizational or institutional structures in place before their participation in Teacher Corps. They were guided by regulations and procedures established for the entire institution or, in the case of many IHEs, for a system of state-run institutions. An institutional structure often facilitated project planning. For example, projects did not have to devise a degree granting procedure because one already existed at the IHE. Also, the established institutions' organizational structure gave them more influence than the community in many sites.

In a number of cases, however, policies of the two institutions either conflicted with each other or with the directives of Teacher Corps Washington. The following illustrates how the standard operating procedure of an IHE and those of the federal mandate clashed:

> Federal grants such as the Teacher Corps project that are administered through existing state institutions must follow that institution's guidelines, giving rise to conflict situations. For example, the university guidelines indicate that we are to reduce total mileage by automobile by 12 percent as compared with last year. Since last year, Teacher Corps activities and resulting travel have increased drastically and will probably continue to do so.
>
> Institutional guidelines also limit the amount of monies that may be spent for hotel rooms, meals and other normal expenses involved with travel. Many of the Teacher Corps meetings and conferences are scheduled in large cities, making it impossible to attend and stay within university guidelines.

> University accounting guidelines present numerous problems to the project. The university accounting office may use different headings or line items than does the project which must operate under Federal guidelines, or in some cases, may combine several line items under one heading, making it difficult to maintain accurate accountability.
>
> On several occasions, the university has questioned legitimate expenditures under Teacher Corps guidelines that do not fit university guidelines. Examples include paying the travel expenses of interns and the reimbursement of LEA staff members to conferences even when those expenses are legitimate under Teacher Corps guidelines.

On occasion, the institutional procedures of one of the institutions made Teacher Corps projects appear to be unresponsive to their constituents. A documenter from a project operating in a large city school system described how slowly plans move through that system:

> One other lesson learned is the extreme difficulty in dealing with a bureaucracy. This city system is so large that it becomes almost impossible to finish activities with dispatch. Everything must be done through channels with proper documentation and support. When one is representing a group of people such as Teacher Corps in-service participants and is asked to do something for them--like arrange an English presentation at a departmental meeting--and it takes a month to make all the arrangements, you really lose credibility with the group. This becomes even more difficult and complicated if the problem pertains to money--this could take months to resolve. It would be alot easier if this could be broken down, and, as soon as someone learns how to do it, I'll be the first to buy their book. I should add, however, that this bureaucracy exists at the university level also and can cause just as many, if not more, problems.

Organizational incompatibilities were often easily overcome but had serious consequences for Teacher Corps efforts in some local sites. The complications that arose were largely unforeseen, and they raise basic questions about the degree to which the two institutional partners and the federal government can remain flexible in accepting the differing procedures of the others. Because the Teacher Crops project is created in between existing structures, its survival depends on its ability to

accommodate those structures, at least until long-run institutional changes are made.

Geographic Distance

Ideally, IHE and LEA staffs should be able to meet spontaneously and often. However, many projects linked institutions that are separated by many miles. Field-based training and collaborative planning became difficult as the number of miles increased. Many rural and some semi-urban projects encountered substantial logistics problems in arranging workshops or simply in staying in regular communication, as suggested by the following comment from a documentor of a Native American project:

> ...the physical distance between (IHE and LEA) makes it harder for the two to get to know each other, and tends to polarize these two factions of the same project. There are many phone calls and trips between the two sites but it is sometimes hard to coordinate everything between the two separate places.

In an extreme case, a distance of 200 miles between IHE and LEA greatly complicated travel. Face-to-face interaction was reserved for prearranged meetings, which became more formal than many project participants would have liked. Even a distance of 20 miles substantially complicated arrangements for interactive planning for teachers and interns.

Where distances were great, a number of creative solutions emerged for maintaining a collaborative working arrangement. For example, one project chartered an airplane once a week to fly IHE professors to a remote site, and another project stationed resident faculty in isolated areas. The following description of a more modest solution in another rural site underscores the need for flexibility in bringing about training in the field:

> The training mainly will occur in the two communities rather than holding all classes at the university. It proved to be a big incentive for enrollment for this particular class to have the instructor "riding the circuit" rather than participants making a 140 mile round trip to attend classes. Flexibility is important in designing the program.

Cultural Differences

Cultural differences between collaborating personnel in the partner institutions create a different kind of "distance" between the institutions. The problem reflects the fact that most low-income school districts contain large numbers of people from differing ethnic backgrounds. A successful Teacher Corps program will take special precautions to develop effective, sensitive communication channels among participants. Communication problems were most often seen in the interaction between project participants and community people, but they also occurred between representatives of the partner institutions.

In one of the case study sites, for example, most of the LEA and IHE personnel came from different ethnic backgrounds. Communication between the institutions was complicated not only by geographic distance, but also by different norms for conducting business. The IHE personnel tended to follow communication procedures characteristic of large organizations, such as relying on the telephone and memoranda. In contrast, LEA personnel were accustomed to conducting most business through informal face-to-face conversation. Open conflict has been avoided because of frequent (although difficult) efforts by both sides to communicate with one another and through the efforts of an IHE staff member who "rides the circuit" regularly between the IHE and the LEA. In a similar vein, the documenter from a rural southern project captured the importance of recognizing and working with local protocol when dealing with the LEA as well as with the community:

> Our project is working in an ultra-conservative environment in which "outsiders" are viewed with suspicion. "Outsiders" are those who are not immediate residents of the community, and include university faculty. In view of this milieu, the project staff has carefully avoided working directly with various personnel, preferring to work with "significant others" who come from the various constituencies and then having the "significant others" take the leadership role with project staff serving as facilitators.... The people in this geographical area have a "protocol" that cannot be violated without raising suspicion. Mrs. Jones must be addressed as "Mrs. Jones." Entry into the school system is through the superintendent. Entry into the school or community is via the principal. The superintendent would not violate their

protocol and talk to community members without going through the principal. To do otherwise invites suspicion and mistrust.

Retrenchment Conditions

As stated, Teacher Corps was born in an era of growth but has matured in an age of decline. LEAs face a set of problems associated with declining enrollments and fiscal austerity. They are no longer worried about raising money to build new schools; they must confront parents and teachers with unpleasant news of school closures and teacher layoffs. IHEs face a related set of problems. The flood of young students into teacher training programs has reduced to a trickle, and IHEs have trouble placing these few students in teaching jobs.

Previously, inexperienced teachers could always find jobs in low-income schools if they received no better offers. Today, however, low-income schools are an extreme example of the devastating effects of declining enrollment, teacher layoffs, and financial constraint. The following comment by a dean illustrated both the problems and the possibilities present in such a situation:

> The Teacher Corps project...is located in a school district where grinding poverty, the insensitivity of a large city bureaucracy, low teacher morale, racial problems and a shrinking school budget make any educational enterprise difficult. Such a site, however, has much to commend it in terms of providing the kind of challenge that Teacher Corps needs in order to prove the validity of its strategies and principles. In my opinion, this particular Teacher Corps group has proven that it can build a strong collaboration between school, community and college whose strengths enable schools even in such desperate circumstances to not only meet immediate needs but to demonstrate ways of working in difficult districts that are exportable and have universal application. This is because there has been an intelligent and consistent effort made to understand community needs and to meet these through soliciting community support on the one hand, and applying effective educational know-how on the other. Teacher Corps, in this instance, has been able to act as an agency through which community cooperation has been matched with college leadership and expertise to maximize the delivery of educational services in an area badly in need of such positive influences.

> In consequence, both community and college have gained by the development of new ways to meet the challenges of the inner city.

As this quotation suggests, retrenchment conditions associated with declining enrollments created an unusual opportunity for Teacher Corps at the same time that the LEA had to wrestle with problems associated with decline.

The reduced demand for new teachers similarly created a new opportunity as well as a problem for IHEs. IHEs are becoming increasingly aware of the "new market" of experienced teachers in the schools who need problem-specific training. Federal and state regulations (e.g., PL 94-142, bilingual education) have changed teaching significantly enough that many teachers require additional training. As IHE professors become more accustomed to field-based education and to problems in the field through Teacher Corps participation, they can be expected to offer training relevant to working teachers' needs.

Bringing Together Training Institutions Within the Project Itself

The Teacher Corps mandate creates a new organizational entity, the Teacher Corps project. This "temporary system" is the vehicle for the two established systems of the IHE and the LEA to join forces in teacher training. The most direct impact of federal money and guidelines is the shape of the Teacher Corps project itself. Ultimately, it is hoped that the activities of the project will have a permanent influence on the actions of the two-partner institutions, but such effects will not be detectable for several years. The immediate goals of the planning year were to put together a viable project organization, assemble a core staff, and provide the staff with the necessary support to do its work. Case study evidence and essay documentation provide a basis for understanding the most significant implementation issues encountered at the project level during the program's initial stages.

Although small relative to its parent institutions, the Teacher Corps project is a remarkably complex entity, when one considers the array of part-time participants (e.g., teachers, some IHE faculty, parents, and administrators) whose primary jobs are not paid for out of Teacher Corps funds. The entire project comprises a fragile collaborative network of people performing roles that require careful definition and articulation. What results in each project is both a formal system of roles, groupings, and tasks and an informal network of trust and familiarity between participants.

Implementation Issues in Constructing a Project

The comments of the documenter from Carlyle State,* a Program 79 project, exemplify the experiences of many projects as they struggle with organizational issues during the planning year. Early in the planning year, the documenter's essays touched on a wide range of problems, many of which related directly to the organization of the project:

---

*The name has been changed to maintain privacy.

> The year of planning was disorienting initially, as we were all wondering what we could possibly do with all that time! We were also reacting to our public's demands of "when are you going to do something?" We have struggled to restrain our impulse to produce and have merged planning and programming into an action mode. By organizing workshops in response to identified needs in the system, we are gathering data for future program implementation and satisfying the demands of the district.

Rules for staff members were difficult to define, and efforts to work jointly were complicated by the special geographic characteristics of this site:

> The LEA district is very large and the schools are spread widely across the area. To insure our project "keeping an ear to the ground," the inservice coordinator and community coordinator were placed in the field at "outposts." The community coordinator is located 20 miles from the college where the director and documenter are housed. The inservice coordinator is about 30 miles from the college and 10 miles from the community coordinator.
>
> The placement in outposts has made communication among staff members difficult and has affected our development as a strong, integrated team. We are all wrestling with our role descriptions and functions, which is not unusual for a new project, but the effort is compounded by our distance from one another. It is difficult to coordinate individual efforts, identify and express our needs as related to the project, or establish clear and effective in-house communication while separated from each other. As a result, we are at times overlapping tasks, we are fuzzy about our roles in the project, and we are each missing a broad perspective of how the project is moving towards its goals.

During the planning year, the Carlyle State project was required to form a policy board and recruit a team leader/intern team as part of the planning activities. The staff wrestled with the policy board's relationship to them, and early in the year were doubtful about its usefulness:

> The Policy Board consists of LEA superintentent, IHE dean and Community Council chairperson. These persons represent the three institutions we are working with--or do they?
>
> What is the function of a Policy Board to be--a rubber stamp for decisions made by our staff or a responsive policy-setting group? Do people in top management positions necessarily

have insight into the needs, concerns, thoughts and feelings of their populations? Is it possible to know what kind of policy best meets the needs of all three groups from such a distance?

We have a lot of questions relating to the form and function of the Policy Board. As yet, we haven't felt the benefit of the Policy Board. They seem as unsure of their role and function as we are, and seem to prefer not having the responsibility of discussing or creating policy. So far the function of the Policy Board has been a problem to solve instead of a useful component of the project. An example of the attitude was expressed by one member like this, "You (the director) should come in to us with what you want already in mind and let us know what we should do to support your decision."

Later in the year, the identity of the teacher-intern team was also a subject of considerable debate:

There is a constant debate among staff, other projects and this component about the purpose of the intern program. Are the interns there to be trained or to provide services for the project? Can these two purposes be balanced and/or interfaced to accomplish both purposes? The phrase "use of intern teams" (found in the essay topic assignment) signifies using interns to implement programs for the project--that interpretation would provide four more people with whom to do work. I don't think we can neglect to include the importance of the training aspect of intern teams; that aspect will also provide Teacher Corps projects and cooperating institutions with some valuable information....

In gradual stages, the project personnel found answers to their questions in their persistent search for a way to make the collaborative goals of the project become a reality. The documenter's essay responses later in the year suggest that both the formal structure of collaboration and the informal network of trust relationships on which it depended had begun to be built:

Our project staff, in stubbornly upholding our belief in collaboration, is beginning to experience the payoffs from the shared effort and trust-building that come from participatory problem-solving. Collaboration is a chance to establish a unique parity relationship among college, public schools, and community. It is hard work to establish and operationalize. We have successfully implemented a structure in which problem-solving and training are planned, implemented, and evaluated by groups made up of three institutions.

In the same essay, the documenter reflected on the roadblocks encountered and some of the project's solutions to them:

(1) Building Trust in the Process: We had to prove to all the populations that this was not another attempt to "pacify the masses" by having them involved in the process. Previous superficial involvement in making decisions (curriculum changes, buying materials, discipline codes, etc.) have made them suspicious of the gesture to have them involved. We had to prove to them that they were in control and had the power to influence and direct the final outcome of problem-solving.

(2) Delaying Gratification - Prevention Versus Reaction: The staff and the councils had to fight the impulse to "do" and "perform" in order to satisfy the needs of some teachers and parents before sufficient planning had been finished. The support for long-range planning in public education is almost nonexistent. It was difficult to convince the "hurting people" that patience and thoughtful planning would be more beneficial than a "band-aid."

(3) Dealing with Inexperienced Planners: We had to prepare each group for the planning process by training them in problem-solving techniques, decision-making and communication skills (particularly listening). The subcommittee leaders also received leadership and facilitation training.

(4) Bridging Traditional Rivalries: The teacher and the parent/community group are traditionally rivals in the public school arena. Who should control the school? The people who pay the bills or the educators in the schools? Parents are suspicious and critical of what happens in the schools and teachers are protective and defensive of their control over what happens in the classroom...The emotional tenderness between the groups must be dealt with before the groups can work effectively in bridging the gap between the groups. The traditional perceived elitism of the college group has prevented the feelings of equality/parity in collaborative efforts. Breaking through the facade of "superiority" (a provider of higher education and intellectual academic pursuit) on the part of college members and elevating the self-esteem of community members so that each group perceives the inherent worth of each other's contributions is essential....

(5) Clearing Away the Mud: More times than not, groups in the midst of exploring solutions to a problem will get lost in muddy waters, losing their direction and grasping at attractive immediate solutions. It has been our role to provide support and the reassurance that clear water is

> above them and hard ground lies beneath them. Training people inthe working groups (subcommittees) to play this role is essential to the institutionalization of the process....

The experiences of the Carlyle State project bring into focus the following set of important issues relating to the project-level organization tasks of the planning year:

- The role of the director
- The role of the policy board
- The problem of clarifying and articulating staff roles
- The relationship of the teacher-intern team of the broader project.

These issues applied broadly to the full range of projects in the Teacher Corps Program, as suggested by essay documentation from a number of sites and by case study work. A fifth area of concern, not alluded to in the Carlyle example, but that many projects commented on, was:

- The influence of external support groups, including the Teacher Corps National Program.

The Role of the Director

The director of Teacher Corps projects has an exceedingly complex role. He or she must simultaneously function as a planner, manager, diplomat, trainer, and intellectual leader for the fledgling project. In essence, the director is the hub of the project. Most information from Teacher Corps Washington about project operations is transmitted to the director, and information about each component of the project is conveyed to Washington by the director. In this central role, the director becomes the choreographer of activities at the IHE, LEA, and community. A successful director listens well, clearly, and with sensitivity, and interacts with diplomacy and good cheer. He or she also has credibility in the IHE, LEA, and community. One documenter commented on the difficulty of combining these skills in one person:

> The naivete which is conspicuous in Teacher Corps is clearly represented in the single role of the project director. This person apparently is expected to lead both the IHE and LEA components as well as exert influence on the Community Council.

> Given the nature of these formal and non-formal organizations, such a role designation is unlikely to result in the kind of coordination which is essential if program outcomes are to be reached. (There is a) need for shared leadership in projects which involve cooperative arrangements with different institutions.

Most projects selected directors from the IHE. They usually tried to find a professor experienced and interested in working with schools and the community and, ideally, one who had previously established credibility with the LEA. In a few cases, however, the director was drawn from the LEA staff. As described in the preceding section on "Resolution of Control Issues," conflict between the IHE and LEA sometimes arose when the director was not a member of the IHE staff. LEA-based directors had the difficult task of gaining credibility with the IHE and involving professors in a field-based program.

Some directors from IHEs faced problems within their institution. A complaint was that directors' efforts to coordinate such a complex project as Teacher Corps are not rewarded at the IHE. The director spends most of his or her time coordinating activities and assuring that the three constituents are involved and satisfied. The director rarely has time to reflect on these activities and write about them. In research-oriented IHEs, time spent in the field is not rewarded unless publications result. Documenters described young, untenured directors or directors brought to the IHE solely on Teacher Corps funds who were frustrated by the discrepancies in expectations from the project and the institution. Directors who had an established position within the IHE and those who had earned the respect of other faculty and administrators appeared to be less concerned with conflicting demands. One documenter went so far as to assert:

> The person in charge at the IHE (most probably the director) needs to be a senior level tenured faculty member. This status is perceived as needed in order to generate cooperation from other faculty members, to bring about institutional change, and to protect this person from the "publish or perish" requirements of a non-tenured faculty member.

Most professors gain tenure through their publication record, not through management or interpersonal skills. As the following shows, qualities beyond job security are needed:

> (The director's) successes in relating meaningfully to groups widely different in social background, educational expertise, and political orientation were a source of inspiration as the year progressed. "He listens when you talk, a rare thing".... (Interview with Community Council chairperson)

A certain number of project directors resigned the directorship during or after the planning year. The diverse demands and lack of tangible rewards were often too discouraging for directors. Even skilled directors became frustrated at times and commented that the job is "exhausting mentally, physically, and emotionally." Despite complaints and occasional frustration, however, most project directors remained in their position and enjoyed the challenge.

The Role of the Policy Board in Project Leadership

The documenter from Carlyle State raised questions about role and function of the Policy Board that reflect questions raised by other projects. During the planning year, each project formed a Policy Board consisting of at least the IHE dean, LEA superintendent, and the Community Council chairperson. Some projects also added other members, most often a teacher representative. Although the membership requirements for the Board were specified in the Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations, the rationale for selecting two top administrators and a spokesperson for the Community Council was not. On one hand, top-level support for the Teacher Corps project was necessary if the new entity was to survive; on the other hand, institutional leaders lacked the closeness to the project to feel comfortable in their roles as policymakers. Also, their busy schedules and multiple responsibilities often curtailed their regular participation in Teacher Corps events and even in scheduled Policy Board meetings.

During the planning year, projects expressed mixed feelings about the Policy Board. A number of documenters commented on the rubber-stamp quality of Policy Board participation, at least during the early

stages of the projects' existence. Others noted the "formality of the Board, which contrasted with the open climate most projects sought to create. The following essay excerpt highlights difficulties one project encountered in forming a Policy Board and involving it in project planning:

> The time and depth of investment of human emotions required to reconcile Policy Board issues related to institutional change, concerns, personal concerns, program goals and objectives and the sharing of limited resources have consistently posed major frustrations.
>
> The difficulties of transferring from the more "open" and flexible concept of the "traditional" governance structure of Teacher Corps Advisory Councils to the more "closed" and conservative phenomenon of the Policy Board combined to immediately banish roles and functions of some other representatives who had played major roles in project governance.
>
> Policy Board members needed a great deal more time than anticipated or planned to build trust (a continuous need), positive, open attitudes of sharing, and understanding and acceptance of program goals and objectives.

As this excerpt indicates, many Policy Boards were more concerned with start-up problems than with policy issues. Projects struggled to agree on the kinds of issues that the Policy Board should resolve and those best left to the project staff. Many Policy Boards provided little support or direction to the projects, so the director and project staff were in the position of making what they considered policy decisions to set the project in motion.

Over time, however, Policy Boards could and did assume a more active and influential role in shaping and supporting many projects. A documenter wrote the following from the perspective of the project's second year:

> The structure and organization of (our) Policy Board has been and still is very formal. However, due to attitudes developed during the controversies of the planning year and an expansion of the Board, this year's meetings have had greater and more open participation by Board members and as a result, no controversies have erupted.
>
> Policy Board meetings are scheduled for the second Friday of each month. One week prior to each meeting, an agenda, minutes of the previous meeting, and staff recommendations are mailed to each Board member. Organizationally, the Board has

functioned and continues to function in a rigid, formal manner. In the past, this formality has prevented free, open discussion among members. After all the controversy of the planning year, Board members have grown to know and respect each other. At the last two meetings, an atmosphere of friendship and understanding penetrated the whole meeting--a drastic change. Nothing seems controversial any more.

The previous turmoil caused Board members to become very knowledgeable of project goals and Teacher Corps regulations. This knowledge and understanding has led to increased involvement and ownership. To maintain their momentum, the project staff recommended and the Board approved the expansion of the present Policy Board to include certain key LEA personnel (stakeholders). So far the results have been impressive.

The Policy Board is designed to be a vehicle to involve top-level administrators who would otherwise spend little time with the Teacher Corps project. Their active involvement is essential if the project is to remain active after Teacher Corps funding expires. Two issues frustrated efforts to involve the Policy Board actively. The first relates to the issue of primary control of the project. Disagreements over distribution of resources and responsibilities occupied some Policy Boards to the point that collaboration ceased. The second issue involves the lack of conceptual clarity of the Board's leadership and policy-setting role. Projects and their Policy Boards often struggled to create a role for the Board that was active and informative but not overpowering and overly protective. Possibly further definition of the Policy Board's role or, alternatively, the presentation of several kinds of governance arrangements would benefit many of the projects.

Clarifying and Articulating the Roles of the Core Staff Team

At the heart of each project was the "core staff team," a group of people who drew a substantial portion of their compensation from Teacher Corps funds. These people carried out the day-to-day work of coordinating and administering the program. Each project decided on how to staff the project; the only roles specified by the Rules and Regulations were the director and the team leader/interns. Documenters typically came from the IHE, as did most project directors and other personnel such as

program development specialists. Team leaders came from the ranks of the school teaching staff. Interns often were recruited from student populations and represented the ethnic background of the communities. Community coordinators were often people active in the community, previously employed by neither the IHE nor the the LEA.

These people occupied positions that were new, and that rarely fit any institutional job descriptions. New projects faced an immediate task: to translate conceptions of each role into actual practice and to integrate all the roles into an effectively functioning team. Establishing good communication patterns seemed to be of paramount importance. Many documenters mentioned the various efforts to make this kind of communication happen; they used devices such as workshops, retreats, and specialized forms of staff training. Some projects even viewed the core staff group as a microcosm of the project as a whole, in which the collaborative spirit could be developed as a model for the relationship between all participant groups. The following essay excerpt is an example:

> The collaborative mode of operation has been established as an integral element of our project staff development. Indeed, the collaboration between components of the staff (core group, documentation/evaluation, secretarial) had been visualized as a model for the cooperation of the constituent groups of the wider project. Very early in our association, we established the importance of communication as essential to collaboration. The documentation/evaluation component was able to demonstrate several lapses in its own efficiency which could be traced to gaps in communication between staff members, and we negotiated with all concerned to be present at a short "communication" meeting to be held approximately once every three weeks. Having experienced two such meetings at this point, members have agreed that the sharing of involvements and concerns had been beneficial for our professional development as a cohesive team. In addition, we have thought it profitable to end the quarter by participating in a two-day retreat which will enable us to concentrate more purposively on processes of group-building and definition of goals.

A number of factors complicated the process of group-building, aside from the fact that the roles were new and were filled by diverse types of people. Many people occupied Teacher Corps positions on a part-time basis; the demands of their other jobs drew energy and attention away

from the task of establishing the Teacher Corps project. Physical distance between staff members, as mentioned in the Carlyle State project description, made communication more difficult, depriving some projects of the sense of togetherness necessary to make a complicated collaborative project work. But an even greater problem was that of first attracting people with the right skills to the project and second, keeping them there.

Staff turnover was a particular problem because of the time and energy demanded of collaborative efforts. The general effect was that activities in the planning year were delayed considerably. A number of documenters mentioned turnover in their essays entitled "Unanticipated Events." They described the needs of rebuilding familiarity and trust with the new member and of removing any negative consequences of the initial turnover. Whether turnover of core staff members continues to be a problem or is mostly a problem with the start-up period remains to be seen; this will be explored at a later stage in this study.

It is not too soon, however, to note that certain roles were more difficult to fill or to keep filled, than others. The most prominent example was that of the community coordinator. For reasons presented in Section II, this position demanded a very unusual combination of qualities but offered little sense of security. Not surprisingly, projects reported many delays in hiring people for this position and many resignations of those who were hired. Turnover in other positions appeared to relate less systematically to characteristics of the position. A general characteristic appeared to be that as Teacher Corps employees, all project staff had to cope with an often tenuous and ambiguous identity. Those less able to handle such an employment situation were more likely to leave.

Several factors appeared to facilitate development of a stable, integrated core staff group. Close proximity to one another, a major time commitment as a Teacher Corps employee, and early efforts to develop communication skills and to address the overlap between roles were among the more significant organizational factors that improved the core staff team. The interpersonal chemistry inherent in any group undoubtedly played as great a role, but this lies well beyond the reach of policy.

Selecting the Team Leader/Intern Team

The Carlyle State documenter described how questions were raised during the planning year about the role the interns would play in the coming year. At most projects, the team leader/intern teams were not formed until the end of the planning year, so their influence on program implementation was limited. Their selection, however, triggered consideration of two issues in Teacher Corps projects.

The first issue involved the role of the team leader/intern team in the Teacher Corps project. The team leader, usually selected from the teaching staff of one of the project schools, was to guide the interns through their graduate program. The team leader was selected after the continuation proposal was submitted so he or she did not develop the plans for training the interns. Because the team leaders were drawn from the ranks of project teachers, the teachers often viewed them as "teachers' representatives" on the Teacher Corps staff. In many projects, the team leader assumed an early dual role of official adviser to the interns and unofficial representative of the teachers. In some projects, directors depended heavily on team leaders for their efforts in both areas, and team leaders appreciated this recognition of their abilities.

The interns also had both an official and unofficial role in many projects. Project staff were frequently surprised at the level of experience and maturity of the interns they selected. They questioned the advisability of limiting the interns to a single role of trainees and frequently encouraged them also to function as resources to the project. As one documenter described,

> Once the interns had been oriented, they were recognized as talented, capable people and given a high degree of autonomy within the structure so that they would freely exercise their knowledge and creativity. IHE and LEA personnel were informed that the interns were not aides or observers or substitute teachers, but rather resource persons who would play a unique role within the program, and that role is to create projects of lasting value that lay beyond the sphere of an individual teacher.

The second issue involved the concept of training teacher-interns that has guided Teacher Corps since its inception. As discussed earlier, in most LEAs new teachers are no longer sought, even in low-income schools. This issue was raised by teachers, parents, and administrators as Teacher Corps project staff explained the program. Some Teacher Corps participants regarded the intern program as both a misuse of funds and as a potential waste of time for interns because they would not be assured of jobs after their training. The following excerpt from a documenter's essay exemplifies such negative reactions to the team:

> The teacher-intern teams are presently seen by both project staff and participating teachers as a not very useful allocation of Teacher Corps funds. Although all parties realize that interns are a mandated component of projects and that their existence is an established part of Teacher Corps history, it is felt that the funds should be spent on components which more directly benefit project communities, the children attending project schools, and the teachers already established in those schools. Resentment was also expressed by teachers toward the use of project money to pay teacher-interns. Although the interns are being paid no more than a beginning teacher (here), some teachers feel that project money should not be used in this way. There are also disagreements with the manner in which the interns are to be placed in the schools. Some of the principals and teachers would prefer to have one intern in the school for the full year, or some other plan, rather than having the four interns move as a team through four schools.

Reactions were often extreme because the team leader/intern team is allocated a large part of the project budget. For example, in a hypothetical (second-year) budget for an urban project totalling $158,000, the portion allocated to the team leader/intern team might typically exceed 40%, broken down as follows:

Team leader salary	$25,000
Intern compensation	26,000
Dependency allowance	3,000
Fringe benefits	9,000
Medical insurance	5,000
Intern discretionary allowance	1,000
Total	$69,000

Despite some participants' complaints and despite the financial burden the team places on the project, many projects regard the team as one of their greatest strengths, and they ended the planning year excited about incorporating them into the project. A documenter wrote:

> [This] Teacher Corps project has always felt proud of the team of interns hired by the project. Individually, and as a group, they have been invaluable to project efforts in the LEA and IHE. Consistently, they have impressed LEA administrators, project teachers and IHE faculty.

Influence of External Support Groups

As originally conceived, Teacher Corps projects were not to exist in isolation from one another or from numerous sources of technical support sponsored under the original Teacher Corps funding in 1978. The networks, training workshops of various kinds, and other services formed a supportive web backing up the projects' start-up activities. Although funding for most of these services ended with the present fiscal year, (FY 80), their impact was apparently substantial, as inferred from the various comments from documenters. The underlying policy question remains: Do these services--or some effective substitute--facilitate the implementation of a program such as Teacher Corps?

Taken individually, different services were found to be especially useful for projects, depending on the nature and special needs of that project. For example, one project with a large number of non-English-speaking students in its schools found regional workshops on bilingual and multicultural education particularly useful. Another project found the regional network to be a source of emotional as well as material support for coping with planning year problems. Even though the support groups were not singled out as a topic for essay documentation, a number of documenters remarked on the usefulness of specific services, especially RCTR (Recruitment and Community Technical Resource), which provided leadership training to community participants, and the CMTI (Corps Member Training Institute) summer institute for teacher-interns.

The elements of the supportive network were not always made available to projects in an organized or clearly understood way. Participating in the numerous network meetings, regional conferences, and special-interest meetings placed a substantial added demand on staff time. In some projects, this time demand and the manner in which special services were offered was viewed as a mixed blessing, as the following documenter's comments illustrate:

> Perhaps the most disappointing lesson learned during the first year of project planning was the lack of useful information and assistance from the national and regional Teacher Corps support groups, especially SSTA*, RCTR, and networks. Two factors compounded the various support groups' inability to provide useful information to the project. First, it was assumed that the project director knew in advance about the existence and the purpose of the groups. In fact, the director was provided with little prior information about the groups, resulting in knowledge only through actual experience and hearsay. Second, the groups presented dogmatic views and methods which not only conflicted with each other but, more importantly, were inconsistent with project specific goals and perspectives. Often assistance provided by these groups was viewed as self-serving. Related to this was a perception of project personnel as being viewed less competent than the technical assistance providers. In point of fact, the IHE and LEA are recognized as national leaders in many aspects of education and each have personnel equally or better qualified to provide technical assistance.

More often, projects found elements they could use from the supportive services, although comments such as the following about the overall organization of the services were not unusual:

> The supportive mechanisms for projects...have also grown by addition and need to be organized and thought through once again by integration processes rather than additive ones.

> The experience of our project has been positive in that network activities have proven stimulating and conducive to learning with and from other projects, and that other "technical assistance" groups have been of specific help in a couple of instances. More of the individualized, specific support might be built in--but by using already existing structures rather than by adding more. Some of the confusion about where to go for what might be eliminated by better organization and clearer communication about function.

---

*Site Specific Technical Assistance

An important question remains to be answered, now that provision of these supportive services has been terminated: Can projects find the help they need on their own? Some projects were able to locate specialized local services, especially in the larger urban areas where such resources are more plentiful--for example, the music institute working in Ellington School (page 60, Section III). Documentation from projects in other urban centers noted linkages forged between the project and local arts councils, social service agencies, and other local groups. Documentation from rural projects rarely mentioned developing such resources, for reasons presumably relating to the lack of supply. The two partner institutions themselves were also in some cases a source of expertise. The requisite skills were not always present in the host institutions, however.

As projects move toward the goal of institutionalization, the availability of local supportive services will become a more central concern. However, the need for some forms of the support may be less strong as projects, in their present and future form, gain expertise in handling organizational and training matters.

The issue of supportive services cannot be considered in isolation from that of the influence of the larger "supporting" framework of the National Teacher Corps Program. It sets conditions on local implementation through budgetary shifts, monitoring of projects, and the annual refunding cycle. A few comments about the way these influences have been felt can be made at this stage in the Program's life cycle. First, the impact of unexpected budgetary cutbacks has been considerable. Plans had to be changed in midstream, which often caused considerable resentment and loss of momentum. The removal of network and other services adversely affected certain training plans. Although budgetary shifts are probably beyond the control of the National Program, their ramifications throughout the projects have been substantial and are only beginning to be felt. A documenter from a large urban project commented that despite the possibility of mitigating some of the immediate effects of the budget cuts, an important psychological blow resulted:

> When the Congress cut the National Teacher Corps budget, it was inevitable that the impact would be felt by this project. Concern was expressed at all levels of participation concerning the specific ramifications of these reductions.
>
> Some project principals expressed concern over the effect of budget cuts on the project's credibility with the participating schools' staffs. When participants are offered a certain program, which then has to be diluted or even dropped because of funding cuts, explanations of the process of congressional review offer scant consolation. Many teachers became anxious that their inservice Master's Degree program might not be delivered. The Community Council also felt its activities threatened by the budget cuts. In sum, the funding reductions were not conducive to the peace of mind or security of project participants...there is a persisting deleterious psychological result of year-to-year uncertainty concerning the level of funding and its projected impact on significant parts of the project...Repeated negative experiences with this process tend to induce in some project members a skepticism towards project planning and a cynicism toward the project's ability to deliver on those plans.

Monitoring of projects was also a topic frequently raised by project documenters, although it was not an assigned essay topic. The documenters indicated that in the early stages of project development, monitors were often able to facilitate the solution of personnel matters and difficult organizational questions in the development of cooperative arrangements between the institutional partners. Some projects complained, however, of project monitor inflexibility. This suggests that monitors' styles and individual interpretations of federal guidelines have distinguished the instances of help from those of hindrance.

Many documenters commented that the funding cycle requirements (continuation proposal submission required by April) were considerable and drew too much staff time and energy away from other important dimensions of planning. A common perception was that the early proposal submission date forced adoption of premature plans. Other projects (possibly those with prior Teacher Corps experience) found that the requirement for a year of planning (broken in the early spring by proposal submission) broke the momentum gained in the early part of the planning year. Project appeared to vary in their perceptions of the rigidity of the planning year requirements.

The Value of the Planning Year for Encouraging Institutional Partnership

Even at this early stage in the overall 5-year cycle of Teacher Corps, we can identify some of the important values of the substantial planning period at the beginning of the project. The strong consensus of documenters, supported by evidence from the case studies, was that the long time frame of the program and the initial year of planning made the collaboration of the institutional partners much more likely. At all levels of the program, the participants had the time to develop the working familiarity with one another that is so necessary for the achievement of a collaborative program. One documenter's reflections on his project's experience with the planning year represent the experience of many:

> The provision for a planning year appears to be a rather straightforward acceptance of a couple of axioms that those of us in education have long expressed but seldom actualized: that front-end planning time saves both time and trouble in the long run and that quality program development is the result of quality planning. The rather brief "year" has had several advantages. First, it has allowed the project staff time to get to know each other well enough to function as a staff. We've had the luxury of disagreeing with each other, learning from each other, and ultimately the time to become a team with more or less common goals for the project.
>
> Second, the planning year has enabled the personnel from the two IHEs, the three schools, and the community to get to know each other well enough to trust the intentions of the various groups if not the specific stand that a group takes on this or that issue. This was particularly important given some rather negative affect in the site of major college "experts" intervening in the local school system.
>
> Third, the planning time permitted the project governance structures and planning structures to "shake down" such that all of the constituent groups could begin to see that they could be heard and that the processes established were more than just abstractions but would in fact work.

Other documenters noted how much the unanticipated events within the specific locale affected the start-up of a new project. As one

documenter suggested, the year allocated for planning the Teacher Corps project provided a cushion that absorbed the effects of these events:

> In the case of our project, "unanticipated events," coupled with the usual "starting up" delays in any school intervention project, have clearly underscored for project staff the important advantage of year-long initial planning time. A negotiations crisis with the teachers' union, negative residual affect therefrom, personnel and role changes in the top leadership positions, lack of consistency in LEA support, and the considerable investments of time in staff "orientation" via national and network conferences and meetings easily have required diversion of considerable planning in their addressing.

The longer range benefits of the front-end planning time are not yet apparent but will be a focus of attention as this study progresses. So far, the many activities of the planning year seem to have provided a foundation on which the institutional partners can build a new and more integrated approach to training.

II INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY

Committed to community involvement in the educational process, Teacher Corps has mandated that each project provide parity in governance among the IHE, the LEA, and the community. The elected Community Council is intended to generate community involvement, and its chairperson is one of the required members of the project's governing Policy Board. Despite the apparent simplicity of this mandate, however, in actual practice Teacher Corps projects have had only varying degrees of success in involving parents and other community members in the operation of the schools.

Community Involvement in One Teacher Corps Project

To illustrate the implementation issues that arise when the community participates actively in Teacher Corps project planning, we have selected a case study site that we will call the Grant City Project.* That project had been a part of Teacher Corps in two cycles before the current one. Its setting is a medium-sized city with a primarily white population. The approximately 15% minority population comprises several ethnic groups. Because of the physical characteristics of Grant City and its school attendance boundaries, the inclusion of the full feeder pattern in the current cycle increased the size of the "community" from the attendance area for one school to about one-third of the city.

The project had no difficulty in defining the community to serve, but the size of the area hindered communication and contact and the heterogeneous socioeconomic characteristics affected community participation. Low-income and subsidized housing units abut the homes of more affluent citizens. Organized neighborhood groups and existing community centers present both opportunities for and barriers to communication and area-wide participation. Overall, however, the citizens of Grant City are interested in and become involved with civic affairs.

*The name of this project has been changed.

Within the project area itself, low-income parents have problems in participating in community and school affairs that are in no way related to a lack of interest. An elected official described residents of the area where the elementary and junior high schools are located as not being politically active. He said they were not joiners, that the home was the center of activities, and that day-to-day survival was a major effort for many. This being the case, Teacher Corps efforts to gain their participation can be only partially successful.

The community coordinator in Grant City project elaborated on the problems associated with a heterogeneous community:

> It's causing us community problems, too, when I have a professor from the university say at a meeting that, speaking as a parent from the project school area, he doesn't understand why math scores aren't higher because all parents have to do is sit down and spend two hours every evening working with their children. Some of those kids don't even have anything to eat when they get home, much less have a parent that will sit down with them for two hours and do homework. Some of those kids either have to babysit all night so that their mother can work, or they have to wonder where their mother is or their father... They don't have books in their homes. Maybe some of them don't have floors in the homes or heat. Someone like that, who says "I speak for the parents in this community," is kind of silly because they don't even know that other part of the community exists. They're not even aware that just a few blocks from them that kind of life is going on...So the problem is if you don't have that kind of parents--the parents with the dirt floors--involved, then you don't have anybody speaking for them. You just have the professional meeting goers speaking for them, and they're not representative of the community. Of a part of it, sure.

This community coordinator has done considerable volunteer work in the schools and community but does not have an academic background. Project participants indicated that a local person is an asset in soliciting parent and community input. Indeed, the coordinator commented:

> If someone had come in from the outside and said, "You poor people, let me help you," then I think we might have had a riot. It wouldn't have worked for the project director to have come in with that kind of attitude. Even the interns coming in with that kind of attitude wouldn't have worked.

The principal in one of the schools reinforced this comment when he said,

> So often parents of low-income kids have not had successful experiences with school themselves and, consequently, they have a kind of standoffish fear or reluctance to make their feelings known. Some of the parents sometimes are not as comfortable with professional people as they are with some of their own peers.

The dean of the College of Education expressed his belief that "there is a strong commitment on the part of the project to substantial involvement of the community in lots of different ways," and the project director and other members of the Teacher Corps staff confirmed this. However, being committed to the concept is not sufficient to induce active community involvement. The difficulties were highlighted by the director in the following way:

> In all three of our cycles, including this one as the third, the biggest struggle has been to inform and get involvement from the community representatives. Now, that's not to be negative about our community program but simply to recognize that many, many parents here--and I think it is true nationwide--don't get involved with school activities, don't come up to school unless they are called up or there is some problem. Many of the people in this area carry that feeling with them that if the school calls, something must be wrong.
>
> We haven't had, and probably never will have, complete support from the community. Certainly not complete involvement from all the parents that we would like to have involved with their kids' educational programs. I have great respect for most of the community people and feel that they are a very necessary part of our project. We need to spend as much time as we can to bring them up to date on things and to get their input on program involvement. But, well I guess just like any community, there are those that are opposed to us, those that don't understand us, those that want to cut taxes and they see this as one way to cut taxes, and so on.
>
> We have our problems but I think we have a very positive approach. We say let's look at those problems. And we are not so big that we can't try to work solving some of these problems. I get the feeling from some other directors sometimes that they think it's a hopeless situation and we don't think it's hopeless at all. The problems are problems, maybe, of too many expectations of the schools or too many

things going on in the Teacher Corps project so that we can't focus on just one thing and do it well. Maybe those are good problems to face.

Another issue in community involvement was defining the role of community members, particularly for those elected to the Community Council. The federal projects administrator in Grant City district believes that the federal requirement for community participation in the project and parity in representation on the Teacher Corps Policy Board may not be realistic and can lead to conflict if the parents think that either the Council or the Board has powers in district educational policymaking that go beyond the Teacher Corps project operations. He pointed out that legal and fiscal responsibility for educational decisions and operations lies with the elected or appointed board of education.

The Grant City community coordinator discussed the difficulty in electing a Council that is truly representative of its constituency when the geographical area of the Teacher Corps project is so large that parents in one area do not know or have contact with parents in other areas of the city. The coordinator said:

> One of the things I have problems with in Teacher Corps is not the requirement for a Community Council but the way the federal guidelines, the regulations, say the Community Council has to be elected. I think it probably works very well in an area where you have housing projects and the school is there and all the parents of kids who go to that school live within twelve blocks. Then you can have an election that involves those people and elect your twelve or fifteen or twenty people to the Council. But we don't all live in that kind of an area. When you live in an area with busing in the school system, you have to elect these fifteen people from the entire city. It's a farce. People who live out in the western area don't know people who live in the inner city. They never will. They might accidentally run into them at a football game, but you know what I mean. They're not going to vote for somebody they don't know and if they do, then again it's a farce. It's not real.

A high school teacher agreed that the parents who were elected to the Community Council or who attended meetings were not completely representative of the greater Grant City area, nor were they necessarily

representative of the areas they claimed to represent. That teacher observed that:

> Most of the people who go to the meetings are professional meeting goers. They're putting in their time and representing a group...you rarely see the typical parent...It's very interesting. It's very efficient. Business is done. They accomplish a great deal. It's very parliamentary, but we close out a great deal of people.

Issues Affecting Community Involvement

Several issues in obtaining community participation in a Teacher Corps project were explicit or implied from our conversations with project and school personnel in the Grant City project. The following two preconditions for successful community involvement emerged from the case study:

- History of community participation in the educational process.
- Commitment of project staff to involving the community in Teacher Corps activities.

These preconditions imply the readiness of the community to become effectively involved and the readiness of the project to include the community. Building on this base, two areas of planning year activity contributed directly to making community involvement a reality:

- Development of adequate communication patterns, collaboration, and trust.
- Election and establishment of the Community Council.

The following discussion will explore the preconditions and areas of activity in other projects, with reference to the experience of the Grant City project.

Sources of a Project Climate Conducive to Community Involvement

In Grant City, the community and the project did not resist coming together within the Teacher Corps framework, partly because they had collaborated in the past. As indicated, however, favorable community characteristics and successful past working relations do not guarantee collaboration; the project's active and consistent commitment to involving community members in planning is essential.

Community Characteristics and History of Participation

Teacher Corps is not the first project to seek active parent involvement in the schools. Consequently, parents often have strong

feelings about participating in government-funded programs based on their previous experiences. As one documentor wrote,

> The level of community participation in programs which are brought into the school community is a function of a cluster of variables which are deeply imbedded in the previous experiences of parents with the school system. This cluster of variables includes not only the attitude of parents regarding the effectiveness of schooling to facilitate personal goals, but also the sense of the community pertaining to the manner in which the school values their participation.
>
> When an effective organization exists within the community for the purpose of promoting school-community linkages, a nucleus of parents can be easily activated for specific projects. Parents who have experience in working with school projects appear to be aware of territoriality problems within the school system.
>
> The local history of any program site is important. Here, there are a number of important factors. First, the program staff have had a long history of personal and institutional interactons with the community members. Both live within the social system of the community, as well as working for the educational system. Second, the Community Council itself is composed of smaller groups of people with long histories with each other. Third, the community had gradually begun to feel more self-confident in its dealings with its institutions, and this Council will reflect and be influenced by this developing relationship. Fourth, using volunteer organizations as a place to learn and from which to move into full employment or elected office has been a pattern for community members. Whether or not Council members see themselves as participating in this pattern and where they are in this process are important for program staff to be aware of. Finally, Teacher Corps Programs should be aware of any conflict between a school or school system and the community members and work against becoming the flash point for the conflict.

As other documenters expressed either explicitly or implicitly in describing the community component, however, preexisting conflicts are difficult to avoid and must be faced directly. As one documenter wrote:

> Avoiding the history, pretending that it either doesn't exist or that the program will begin its own history, is a mistake that should be avoided.

These comments reinforce the impression that for successful implementation of a project, administrators must take into account the

existing conditions in the community, other programs operating in the schools, and the support system that is available through the district offices.

Commitment of Staff to Involving the Community

Across all Teacher Corps projects, the level of commitment to and success in achieving active community involvement varied. One documenter wrote as follows about the necessity of providing support for the community component and particularly for the Community Council:

> The community role group does not have the institutional structure or history of involvement enjoyed by the IHE and LEA. The diversity of individual backgrounds of the community representatives, although interesting and desirable, can create a committee characterized as a wandering generality without a sense of common purpose. Leaders from the IHE and LEA can assist in helping the newly formed group in establishing a partnership among the role groups without exerting unnecessary control. These leaders can initially act as advisors and interpreters on matters of policy, procedure, terminology, and the "givens" or parameters of the project.

Another documenter praised the leadership style of the project director as he worked with the Community Council.

> One of the style characteristics of the local director is implicit in the difference he draws between manipulation, influence, and control. He believes that control and manipulation on the part of program staff will destroy the credibility of the program in the eyes of the community. The actuality of the program operation must match the rhetoric of community control of their council. He sees influence as being able to state his ideas strongly and clearly and openly, but he will not either subvert or rescind a decision that the council or decisionmaking mechanism within the council has made that does not agree with his ideas.

The documentation and case studies clearly indicate that the sincere desire of the Teacher Corps project staff for community involvement and a leadership style that is supportive and invites participation and collaborative problem-solving not only facilitate community involvement, but are also essential if the mandated governance model is to be successful. This commitment to the community is manifested in the way

communication channels are opened and maintained, which in turn leads to development of trust.

Development of Communication Patterns, Collaboration, and Trust

Fulfilling in more than a perfunctory way, the Teacher Corps mandate for joint participation of the community (as represented by the Community Council) with the LEA and IHE was one of the most difficult tasks for Teacher Corps projects in the planning year. Maintaining communication and developing collaboration and trust with the community component were particularly difficult for project staff, especially for those such as community coordinator who had primary liaison roles.

Overcoming Inexperience and Mistrust

For many legitimate reasons, residents in most low-income areas are both mistrustful of schools and lack experience in dealing with these and other institutions. A documenter observed that

> It is important for staff members to remember that community people are at a different place when it comes to operating within formal systems.

Speaking of the Community Council operations, this documenter continued:

> Task orientation may not always be as focused, word choice and the meanings that people attach to the choices will certainly be different. While it may ultimately prove to be an important community institution, it must be remembered that the Council has its beginnings as an artificial system loosely fitted to an already existing organic community.... Careful thought should be given to the interaction of required Teacher Corps mandates for the community and the existing local norms and expectations. Two examples come to mind in a large city: the Policy Board will be composed of two individuals who are relatively sophisticated in the exercise of authority, the superintendent and dean, and one who may not be, the Council Chairperson. This difference is heightened by the fact that both the superintendent and dean are administrators of institutions with vested interests. Probably, the two institutions have had a prior history of accommodation and negotiation. There are potentially strong currents or norms which may work against the theoretically equal tripartnership of community, school system, and university on

> the Policy Board. This partnership between community and institution is also apt to rest on uneasy history with regard to community participation in school system decisions.... Formal mechanisms for communicating with the Council must be effective and timely. It seems unnecessary to say this, but the fact remains that the community does not speak "educationese," nor are community people necessarily on the same timetable as school people. More important is the necessity of understanding the informal communication mechanisms in the community.

Many parents are not actively involved in the education of their children except when a problem is brought to their attention. Low-income parents particularly may feel intimidated by professional educators. Members of the project staff had to learn not only to communicate with each other, but also to communicate with the community using words that would not exclude them. One documenter commented on the importance of communication as follows:

> The major lesson learned was the difficulty in keeping the lines of communication open to this large, diverse group of people. I am reminded of the story regarding the feather pillow that was scattered to the wind. It is impossible to regain all the feathers that were orginally there. Our communication process is a lot like this. One misstep, one forgotten person or group, and you can spend days trying to mend the broken channels--an almost impossible task.

Another documenter suggested that the community members were not only sensitive about whether they were included, but also suspicious about whether their input would have any effect. Although deeply rooted, these suspicions could be overcome, as the documenter indicated:

> Building ownership of the program was another element in this lesson. Skepticism abounded and was constantly combated; people initially did not perceive that their participation could make a difference to the school and the community. At the end of year one, however, one Community Council member made all the efforts to collaborate worthwhile when she offered the comment, "We really are not just rubber-stamping ideas in the program, but instead have a real opportunity to set directions for ourselves."

A number of documenters underscored the importance of time in allaying community members' mistrust and developing familiarity with the organizational issues of the Teacher Corps project. Clearly, experience could only be gained through extended association with the project, so

Community Council members needed time to learn what it meant to represent their community's interests in the Teacher Corps project.

The Communications Role of the Community Coordinator

As the Grant City case study suggested, the community coordinator is an important and necessary link between the project and the community. SRI project site visitors' observations and the documenters' essays indicated that the coordinator played an especially key role during the first year in communicating project purposes and goals to residents of the community, in seeking participation from parents and other stakeholders, and in organizing the Community Council election. One local community council consultant (LCCC), who prepared a report on the election as part of the documentation for SRI, noted:

> No matter how well organized one is, keeping people first is the prime responsibility of the LCCC during the election. The election period is a time of building credibility and the way one does that, regardless of television appearances and newspaper articles, is through person-to-person contact.
>
> I sometimes thought of myself as a spider busily spinning a web during the election process; that is, each new person I met gave me access to several other persons. And as I followed up on each of these contacts, new ones emerged so that a web (network) of community resources and people gradually was woven.

The community coordinator's description captures the importance of constant personal contact that was alluded to in many other essays. Further comments by the same coordinator indicated that the problem was not only to "spin the web" of contacts, but also to keep it intact among both the community members and the important IHE and LEA participants:

> A second item I have realized during the election process is the idea that constant communication among all components of the network is an absolute necessity. The LCCC's role, in many ways, is similar to that of a ping-pong ball; that is, the Community Council bounces an idea to the LCCC (and the LCCC becomes a ping-pong ball--the idea) which is then bounced upon the IHE faculty. They return the ball (with modifications) or serve it to the school district personnel. The schools then return the serve (with modifications) to the Council. This process goes on continuously. The key to

> "keeping the ball rolling" (or bouncing!) is that this process must occur on each small phase of every operation. If every group is aware of the actions (or potential actions) of every other group, less chaos is likely to ensue.

The community coordinator's role was clearly a difficult one to accomplish, as the preceding description makes clear. The ability of projects to find and retain the appropriate person for this assignment was a key element in the success of the Community Council election process.

Election and Establishment of the Community Council

The election of the Community Council and establishing its operating procedures and role is an activity that requires considerable time and attention from the Teacher Corps project staff during the first year of the program's operation. Comments by respondents to interviews and documenters' reports clearly indicated that not only the election process, but also the actual functioning of the Council has been both difficult and, in a number of cases, rewarding. The following observations of one documenter are representative of this belief:

> When Teacher Corps first introduced the concept of a community council, the idea was greeted with little enthusiasm by administrators, teachers, and the community as a whole. The county had never had such an elected organization, and the general feeling was that such a council would do little more than fulfill another federal guideline.
>
> But through a little luck and lots of hard work, capable people were nominated and elected to this council. After going through a short "groping period," the Community Council under the leadership of a very knowledgeable and able chairperson began to articulate and confront various community concerns regarding the local school system. Consequently, over the past year, the community has become, much to the surprise of almost everyone, a powerful force in articulating community concerns and mobilizing community resources. The mobilization of community support for local school projects seems to be made possible through the structure of the council.

Other projects met with varying degrees of success, depending on a number of factors in the process: spreading the word about the program and election, the logistics and timing of the election itself, the procedures for ensuring representativeness, and the problem of clarifying the new Council's role and identity.

The Election Process

Many of the project documenters commented specifically on the timing of the election. Others cited problems that could be attributed at least in part to timing. A common complaint was that 90 days is insufficient time to orient the community to Teacher Corps, plan the election, and carry out the balloting, through whatever means is chosen; this is a particular problem if the election must be held at the same time that the schools are beginning their year's activities and the project staff is attempting to get the project underway. The following was typical of the comments from many documenters:

> While the project was organizing and trying to handle miniscule but important houskeeping responsibilities (such as setting up new offices with supplies, hiring secretaries, developing stationery, etc.), the project staff was required to sponsor a mammoth community publicity effort in electing a community council. The staff's lack of knowledge about Teacher Corps support systems, the organizational structure of the project, and the election format (resulted in the lack of development of an effective community council during the planning year).

Generally, projects were able to comply with the requirement that elections be held within 90 days, but a number questioned the quality of the results. As the following comment indicates, rushing the elections can lead to election of Community Council members who are not strongly committed to being a part of the project:

> We had to hold the election so early that many citizens didn't know what Teacher Corps was all about, let alone whom to vote for. Also, due to early date, some ran and <u>were elected</u> who really were not interested in Teacher Corps, but they did not have time to find out what they were getting into.

Clearly, this is one area in which projects with a prior history of community involvement (such as the Grant City project) were more prepared to translate the program mandate into an operational reality.

Regarding the actual election procedures, documenters commented on the location of polling places, use of mail ballots, voting procedures, use of an independent agency (such as the League of Women Voters) to

conduct the election, piggybacking the election onto some other event, and the like. The message that emerged was that each project must determine for itself the procedures that work best in the local environment. In one project where standard election procedures were followed, the documenter attributed the success of the election to the ritual and formality that was introduced into the election process:

> Ritual and formality are important parts of the process of community involvement. Community members sense the importance of what they do if it has the formality and ritual of other institutions. This election had: nomination papers, challenges, registration to vote, campaign funds and receipts, official city ballot boxes, and paid election officials from the neighborhood.

Whatever the results of the election, the process did provide a learning situation for projects in disseminating information about Teacher Corps, in seeking community participation, and in dealing with the interpersonal relationships and dynamics involved in the attempt to create educational change.

Representativeness of Community Council Membership

In a number of projects, the requirement that Community Council members be elected raised the potential problem of lack of representation of important constituent groups in the community. In areas similar to Grant City, the diversity of the community in a given Teacher Corps project was such that conducting an election in which all segments of the community participated equally was difficult. In the following comments, a documenter highlighted this problem and offered a possible solution:

> Those people in our community who tend to run for elections (of any variety) are not likely to be from low-income or minority groups. In fact, the election process seems to be an added barrier to their participation. Rather than attracting the "silent majority" candidates which our Teacher Corps project hopes to serve, we found that our election attracted the "vocal majority" candidates. We also found that when we did have some "silent" candidates nominated, they were not elected because they were not known by other district residents.

> If communities hope to serve low-income or minority residents who have a history of nonparticipation in elections, the election of a quorum of Community Council members might be followed by the appointment of a lesser number of members who could speak for specific groups that did not participate in the election. If possible, these "special" community groups should be identified in the project's proposal or prior to the election. All such appointments should be subject to the approval of the Policy Board.

Other documenters also suggested solutions, and some described solutions put into practice by projects, such as designating seats for certain constituencies and using school principals' contacts with the community at the nominating stage. Part of the problem was apparently to encourage capable people representing certain groups to run for office; another part of the problem was to attract sufficient numbers from these groups to cast votes for their representatives. Some projects were able to find creative solutions to these problems, as one documenter suggested:

> Surprisingly, our Community Council is representative of the community. This is mainly due to the fact that, after realizing our dilemma, we divided our election into two parts, holding the second part of the election during the "Open House Week" held at each school prior to the beginning of the school year.

These comments suggest that perhaps the federal guidelines regarding the election and composition of the Community Council should be modified to require only that the Council be representative of the community, allowing individual projects to select candidates and conduct the election in whatever manner best suits the local situation. As one documenter wrote, "You must develop a plan that 'fits' your project area and not try to impose some outside plan."

Role and Operation of the Council

In discussing community involvement in Grant City, we noted the comments of the federal projects administrator regarding role definition for the Community Council. That this was an issue in other projects was evidenced in documenters' essays, which reveal the facets of the problem. In some cases, the lack of clarity about the Council's role was a further source of mistrust and hence hindered more active community participation.

As one documenter wrote,

> There was apathy in the community. Some concern was expressed as to whether or not the Council would have any real voice in the project. Some doubts were based on experiences with other federal programs. Lack of clarity regarding the role of the Council or the "power of authority" of the Council was raised, presenting a challenge in getting people to become candidates.

In contrast, a few Councils, such as the one described in the following quotations, tried to exercise more influence than was warranted in a collaborative project governed by an overall Policy Board:

> The project's Community Council was extremely interested and involved in the development of Teacher Corps within the community. However, the Council saw itself as a policy board which was responsible for the project's budget and as a decision-maker regarding project services. Because of this lack of role clarification, the Council was not as productive as it might have been.

In many projects throughout much of the planning year, the newly elected Councils groped for a sense of their mission and for an effective set of operating procedures. Some projects organized specialized training programs for Council members to help them develop the skills required to make decisions as a group and to act as representatives of their respective communities. Documenters throughout the program generally agreed that Councils very much needed such support, although sensitivity was required in providing the support without exerting control over the Council. The inherent dilemma was expressed well by one documenter who reflected on the project's planning year experience with the Community Council, which was less successful than it might have been:

> Never allow the Community Council to flounder in attempting to develop their own identity and direction. In an effort to avoid the danger of controlling the Council, I think we inadvertently abdicated our responsibility to provide needed leadership and careful nurturing to a developing group. This, I believe, had led to unnecessary delay in the development of an equal partner in the project.

The Community's View of Community Involvement in Teacher Corps

Up to this point, the views presented regarding issues of community involvement in Teacher Corps and in the educational process have primarily been those of the Teacher Corps project staff. Knowing how the community people felt about their role is equally important. At this point in the study, definitive statements about this issue are premature. However, Community Council chairpersons were given the opportunity to add comments to the self-report questionnaires that they completed this year for the evaluation. The final section of the questionnaire stated:

> We recognize that is is impossible to design a questionnaire that fully captures the experience and reactions of everyone involved with Teacher Corps projects. If you have the time, we would be interested to learn of any aspects of the project or your experiences with it which you feel were not conveyed in your responses to our questions.

The following comments from chairpersons reflect the range of perceptions regarding the community component of the program and its role. Some comments support the impression that productive Community Councils could be created, after an initial period of considerable difficulty, that had the potential for having a long-term positive impact on schools. One chairperson observed:

> The project has given the community a true feeling of being involved in the educational decision process. For the first time for many of us, we feel a sense of contribution to the school learning climate of our children. I believe in the years ahead Teacher Corps will help define and develop the role of the community in the total education of our students.

Another's remarks corroborate this impression but qualify it somewhat, indicating that the relationship of participants to an existing power structure is not easily or quickly changed:

> My role as chairperson of the Community Council has been very satisfying but also frustrating at times. Both the project director and coordinator of the project have tried very hard, and succeeded, in making me and the other Council members feel like we are a very important part of the project. The only time I do not feel comfortable and an equal part is when we meet as a policy board. The authoritative role of superintendent is very much in evidence.

The comments of other chairpersons convey much more anger about the fact that the Councils within their respective projects did not have an effective role. According to one chairperson,

> The Community Council is required by law, but it really is segregated from a project designed almost exclusively for teachers. Community feels left out and pushed out.

The observations of the documenter from the same project did not address the question of the extent to which the chairperson's feeling were based in fact. Nonetheless, what is important is that the chairperson felt excluded:

> Community representatives often lack sophistication in the areas of educational terminology and operating procedures, but may have very strong feelings about how schools should be operated. Leaders from the IHE and LEA must demonstrate patience in working with the community without being condescending and must model appropriate interactive behavior.

The community members expressed the feeling of exclusion from an influential role and also general confusion about the Council's role in the complex collaborative network of the Teacher Corps project. As a chairperson remarked,

> The Community Council is very angry and confused about its role in the project. Too many different definitions of that role have come from too many sources (e.g., TCTR Center, Program Specialist and three different project directors). The Teacher Corps model speaks of a project operated by three entities (school district, college and community council). This project has many more, e.g., the principals, teachers, college faculty are all separate interest groups. It is impossible to tell the players without a program. The Project Director is reduced to playing the role of diplomat pulling all of these diverse groups together simply to maintain the project. A few courses and workshops have been conducted. Some are of questionable value.

The range of opinions across sites and the diversity of views within a given site underscores the importance of further case study work to investigate the subtler chemistry of community involvement in markedly different situations. In further case study work, we will explore these issues in greater depth, not that the range of issues has been delineated. Certain questions of importance to federal policymakers have already come more sharply into focus, however.

Policy Implications of Project Experience with Community Involvement in the Planning Year

Conditions that predate the funding of a Teacher Corps project greatly affect the implementation of the project. Some of those conditions (for example, attitudes and values) may be changed as a result of Teacher Corps operations, but Federal rules and regulations designed for any specific program will most likely not in themselves bring about that change. What will determine how successfully the project is implemented and the results that are obtained is how the local projects translate rules and regulations into strategies and practices.

The Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations are specific relative to community involvement: The community must be a joint participant through an elected Community Council. The Rules and Regulations detail election of this council and the chairperson's participation in the Policy Board. However, to promote community participation in the educational process, federal policymakers should first consider how realistic it is to expect a great many parents to become involved. Moreover, they should take into account the diversity that exists across communities and geographical regions. No single regulation will be equally applicable in all communities. This suggests that the guidelines should be written so as to provide the local project sufficient latitude to develop its own processes and procedures for seeking participation in community councils, PTAs, and other school committees and groups, that is, the local project can best determine "what works" in a particular situation. Perhaps the projects should be offered the option of deciding whether one council can adequately represent the constituency or whether multiple groups, such as one for each school, might be more effective. Policymakers should also reexamine the timing of the Council election. As project documenters noted, the requirement for an election within 90 days after start-up of the project created problems in some projects.

Another area that deserves attention concerns incentives for parent participation, particularly in the Community Council. As one documenter wrote,

> Although in some cases (Community Councils) do not function as adequately as they should, they have been important in developing the community support for students and faculty which is so critical in a cross-cultural situation. Teacher Corps should provide adequate funding for the operation of such bodies and possibly encourage the budgeting of a certain amount of money to pay lay people for their participation on governing boards, especially if they will miss work days and thereby lose pay.

The Value of the Planning Year for Promoting Community Involvement

As was the case with formation of institutional partnerships, the planning year was valuable for establishing the community component of the project. In a number of cases, the time provided the opportunity for Council members to develop the confidence and skills necessary to deal on an equal footing with participants from the two educational institutions. Moreover, the other participants had a chance to get to know and gain respect for the community members. The documenter of the Grant City project spoke for a number of projects when he wrote:

> This time helped the Community Council discuss thoroughly how to improve school-home communications, how to promote more community involvement in school activities, and how to work collaboratively with the schools and the university in the Teacher Corps project.

Relatively few projects, least of all the Grant City project, could assert that at the close of the planning year that all the major problems with the formation of the Community component had been solved, but nearly all could agree that time was one of the key ingredients of a process of gradual growth among community participants. Whether the initial momentum of the projects with successful community components can be maintained remains to be seen. Whether those with faltering community components can overcome the obstacles to success is also yet to be revealed. Nonetheless, the fact that some headway has been made in a particularly difficult facet of program activity gives reason to be hopeful that further gains can be made in this area.

III INVOLVING SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Diverse groups are brought together through the Teacher Corps project to develop a program that will ultimately improve education for low-income students. One of the most important of these groups is the staff of the low-income school--the teachers, principal, the aides who have the most direct influence on the education of students.

This section describes the involvement of school personnel in Teacher Corps project development. The experiences of one case study site are presented to demonstrate how Teacher Corps Program mandates and local conditions combine with the specific conditions of an inner-city elementary school. We do not suggest that this school is typical of Teacher Corps projects in general; rather, it is presented as an example of how ideas are successfully translated into practical action and of what issues arise in program implementation at the school level when isolated and abstracted. The influences that helped and hindered the development of this project can be seen in other accounts of project efforts to plan programs in the school. This case study and examples from other sites raise issues that have implications for policy on school-level interventions.

Planning a Teacher Training Program in Ellington School*

The project director described the atmosphere at Ellington Elementary School favorably, as follows:

> Let me tell you a few things about that school. There's a lot of togetherness in that school. If all the teachers aren't doing the same thing, no one is doing it. Together we have strength. Individually we can't do it. Also, there's a good relationship between the administration and the teachers. Sometimes, even with this (the good relations) the administration will say, "We want this," and the teachers say, "No way," but they have learned to compromise.

The school is located in a low-income section of a large eastern city. Although it is in a predominately white neighborhood, black students are bused from a nearby neighborhood. Ellington is a small

*Fictitious name for an actual case study site.

school, with 16 teachers, 1 principal, and fewer than 300 hundred students. The grade levels are kindergarten through fifth. Nothing distinguishes the school physically from other older elementary schools in the city. The three-story brick structure is divided into classrooms, a Title I room, a language arts center/library, an office, and a teachers' room. In the basement are lunch tables, a sewing room, a photography room and a physical education room, which was added this year. An unadorned patch of asphalt serves as the school's playground.

The positive atmosphere that permeates the school comes not from the physical setting but from the people in the school. Inside the old building, rooms and halls are brightened by children's art work, and the staff, administration, and students seem to enjoy each other and the experience of teaching and learning at Ellington.

Developing the Plans

When the school year began in the fall of 1978, teachers learned that the Teacher Corps project had been funded. Staff from the college came to the school and told them they were free to plan their own program and to identify their needs. A needs assessment was conducted, and the teachers unanimously requested training in physical education and music. The principal, district office staff, and Teacher Corps staff members were surprised and somewhat dismayed by their choice. One teacher said:

> It was the principal who was pushing for language arts and we've already had a grant in the past that I've written; and besides, we have a beautiful reading and language arts center. All the teachers have their master's in reading. We all know how to do it. We know how to teach language arts. They all have ten years behind them. So you don't just pile on something else when we have enough. Spread the wealth. So we wanted to learn. That's what Teacher Corps is about: teaching and training of teachers. The consensus was, "Let's learn something new."

The teachers finally told the Teacher Corps staff, "Give us physical education and music or leave us alone." The principal conceded, hoping that interest in other areas would develop later.

The next step was to plan the two programs and find instructors to teach them. Neither the Teacher Corps staff nor the teachers had direct experience in either content area. As they began searching for available experts or programs in physical education and music, they soon realized that music and physical education programs need not be restricted to singing and dancing. Two experts were found who try to link music or physical education with improved cognitive, affective, and motor learning.

Two Teacher Corps staff members took responsibility for finding a physical education instructor. They contacted a colleague at State (a local teachers' college) who had recently returned from a 1-year advanced training program at a renowned movement institute in England. As this teacher described, she was eager to translate what she had learned in England into a curriculum for elementary school teachers, and she was challenged by the lack of facilities at Ellington:

> He (project director) said the teachers wanted to know how to set up a curriculum, objectives, materials, and how to teach physical education. I said, "Sure, I'll be glad to go over there." He said, "Now, you have to understand one thing. They have no gym; they don't have a field; no physical education teacher, but they have a playground." And I thought, "Oh, goodie. Here is a challenge."

In an introductory presentation to the Ellington staff, she described how physical, affective, and cognitive learning can be interrelated in a physical education program. The teachers quickly shared her enthusiasm for the method.

One of the Ellington teachers contacted a music instructor at a private music institute that is trying to revolutionize music instruction. The music instructor described her enthusiasm about the prospect of teaching a group of elementary school teachers.

> I got very excited because to be asked by a classroom teacher to run a music program is really nice. Usually it's something that's done administratively. Administrators get together and say this is what we want, and they tell the teachers that is what you're going to have.

Once the instructors were selected, the teachers and instructors began planning the courses. Early in the planning, problems arose concerning both budget and focus. A teacher said that she repeatedly asked for guidelines on budget limits but that the Teacher Corps director told her not to worry about it. When the director heard that they could use about $200,000 over the next 2 years, he "almost fell off his chair." He finally promised $4,000 to pay for the teacher training. The discrepancy in budgets was due primarily to different interpretations of what Teacher Corps funds could cover. As the music instructor explained,

> It gradually became clear to us, which was a shock to everyone concerned, to the institute and to the teachers involved, that they couldn't have a music program through Teacher Corps, but they could have a teacher training program. That was not clear for a long time, and it was hard for everyone to accept that. They did not really want to be the music teachers themselves; they really wanted music teachers.

Rather than give up, the music instructor requested funds from the city public schools office to offer demonstration lessons. That office released several thousand dollars. With the combined funds, Teacher Corps paying for the teacher training and the city paying for the demonstrations, the teachers received the program they wanted; the institute was able to offer a program of the quality it tries to maintain, and the Teacher Corps project was able to offer a more elaborate program than Teacher Corps funds alone could have supported.

Putting the Plans into Practice

Both classes began in the fall of 1979. The teachers were anxious to begin training, and the instructors were eager to test their ideas in a new environment. In fact, the courses were so appealing that several teachers from the other project elementary school enrolled. Both instructors had some initial trepidations about teaching classroom teachers, as the following excerpt from our interview with the music instructor indicates:

MI: This is the first time I've taught classroom teachers to be music teachers.

Int: Did you see it as a challenge?

MI: Oh, yeah. It isn't what I would have chosen. There are an awful lot of musicians trying to be music teachers, and they don't have to be trained from point zero. But, on the other hand, these are wonderful people and that part is very attractive. I've come to enjoy this course very much. I look forward to it every week. I enjoy the teachers and we're doing some interesting, exciting things. They are able to do it. I was stunned from the beginning that they can sing well. We've gotten into some very sophisticated musical things.

Both instructors were available to counsel teachers during school hours. The music institute used its grant from the city to pay for a music instructor 4 days a week to offer a music program for first and second grade children. The physical education instructor spent every Wednesday at Ellington. She wanted the teachers to invite her into their rooms to offer master lessons, observe their physical education lessons, and offer advice. She expressed her reaction to the program as follows: "I go out there and I say, 'Oh, how are they going to receive me today?' and by the time I'm halfway through the day it's so thrilling to see them."

Most of the teachers were also satisfied with the instruction and with the added help instructors gave during their classroom visits. Two teachers' comments were:

T1: There's a lot of sharing of ideas. Like yesterday Julie* had a really good lesson with her class, and the physical education instructor had to share it. Since we're on really different schedules, I'd never had a chance to sit down and talk to her about it. That's what I really appreciate. The instructor is great at sharing things. She is available on Wednesday. She has taught my class but I like taking it totally on my own. She's welcome, she knows to come any time she wants.

*Names have been changed.

T2: She will teach a master lesson if we want and we can repeat it if we feel as though we need it.

The teachers were not always happy with the classes, however. As the physical education instructor said, "If they didn't gripe, something would be wrong; I wouldn't be working then." Some teachers resisted visits to their classrooms, believing that they were being "tested." Most of the teachers who complained about the classes, however, were from the other elementary school in the project, and they dropped out in the second semester. An intern enrolled in the physical education class described the start-up of the physical education course:

> At the beginning it was a little shaky because the teachers didn't know what to expect, and they thought she wanted too much work at the beginning. She wanted them to have her observe them at least four times during the year doing activities we had learned in class. Some teachers rejected this idea and decided after the first course not to take her course again because they thought they were being treated like children. The teachers this semester are more adaptive and seem to be enjoying it more than last semester.

The implementation of these field-based inservice classes had an influence on the local teachers' college. Many of the college faculty were active in field-based preservice programs before the Teacher Corps project began, but few have had the opportunity to offer inservice courses in the schools or to spend time in teachers' classes. The physical education instructor said that the experience had been invaluable, and she and other college faculty involved in the Teacher Corps project said they used their experiences in the schools in their college teaching and would not hesitate to encourage colleagues to spend more time in the schools.

The influence of this specific Teacher Corps project on the college's established procedure for offering teacher training may not be known because of changes in other IHE-level regulations. For example, a college administrator said that the trend in teacher training is moving in the direction of field-based education. He said the state board of credentials would soon require more field experience before

students receive credentials. He suggested that National Teacher Corps may have influenced the state's thinking or else Teacher Corps and the state are responding to the same trend. In either event, changes are occurring at the college and the Teacher Corps project can point to successful efforts to implement field-based inservice courses. Although the music instructor is not on State College's staff, her comments reflect growing interest among teacher trainers in field-based education:

> I think that direct services from the college to the teachers is the healthiest thing. To go into the school, to work with people in the school rather than have them come out to the "Ivory Tower" and do something in a theoretical environment. Because there is nothing that keeps you quite so honest as to be right there where it is happening, with the kids.

These classes had several positive side effects. The teachers are now meeting once a month to help each other plan curriculum. At the college, other faculty members are becoming curious about what their colleagues are doing in the schools. The teachers are beginning to feel comfortable in soliciting help from college professors on other curriculum matters, and barriers between the interns and working teachers are dissolving.

Aspects of Implementation Highlighted by the Example

The planning and implementation process at Ellington School was both successful and unusual for several reasons. First, everyone was excited about the opportunity to have time to plan jointly. The teachers and principal had good rapport and were accustomed to working as a team. The college staff was comfortable and familiar with working in the schools. The planning year gave them a chance to define mutual goals and find creative solutions to problems. Second, teachers took responsibility for their own program from the beginning. They believed they knew their needs, and they resisted pressure to address other areas beyond the specific needs. They were even involved in recruiting

instructors for the program, which contributed to their commitment to the music program. Third, everyone involved remained flexible while they planned. For example, when planning started, the principal did not impose his will and order the teachers to plan as he wanted; he hoped additional planning would occur once the initial needs were addressed. In the mind of the principal, the involvement of the staff was a top priority and he supported their expressed objectives. When the planning was under way, the Teacher Corps director did not specify budget limits initially because he wanted the teachers to plan freely. Once restrictions were imposed, the teachers and instructor did not give up their larger goals but sought additional funds. Because the district office supported the Teacher Corps effort, funds were available. These funds diverted the potential confrontation over the differing perceptions of what constitutes staff development.

The descripton of the actual training process emphasizes the importance of continued collaboration between teachers and trainers. It suggests that teachers remain active and involved in the instruction if they are encouraged to use the lessons in their classes and if they see a positive influence on their students. Moreover, the Ellington example suggests that the barrier between college instructors and classroom teachers breaks down when the instructor spends time in teachers' classrooms trying out lessons in the teachers' environment. The success of field-based courses apparently depends greatly on the environment. For example, the physical education course was almost spoiled by the addition of the other elementary school teachers. They had not planned the course, the schedule was inconvenient for them, and they viewed some of the assignments with suspicion. The Ellington teachers, on the other hand, were not always completely satisfied but worked with the instructor to shape a mutually agreeable direction for the course.

The process of planning and offering inservice classes at Ellington School is not unlike the process at many other Teacher Corps schools across the country. The conditions, however, may vary considerably. For example, features of the process that were taken for granted at

Ellington, such as good staff morale, were absent elsewhere. Some of the sources of problems at Ellington, such as incorporating teachers from several schools, facilitated implementation at other sites. Such issues are discussed in the following section.

Sources of a Climate Conducive to Planning at the School Level

Ellington School enjoyed a climate that was very supportive of the Teacher Corps project planning process. The evidence suggests that the following three elements contribute to such a climate: high morale among teachers, cohesiveness among the teaching staff, and flexibility among administrators regarding teacher-initiated planning. Program planners, however, cannot assume that these ingredients will exist in the schools, as the following discussion illustrates.

Teacher Morale

The teachers at Ellington School like where they work and enjoy the children, each other, and the teaching profession. They communicate freely and openly and trust each other, the principal, and the project. They focus on the positive rather than the negative influences around them. For example, Ellington School is scheduled to close before 1985. When asked about the closure, one teacher said, "We can't think about it or we would go crazy."

At many other schools across Teacher Corps projects, however, teachers' morale is not high; teachers are afraid in the schools and they believe they are overworked, underpaid, and unappreciated. When morale is low, and when little trust exists between teachers and project staff, the project staff has a more difficult time in convincing the teachers that their needs will be taken seriously and that their participation in important decisions will be requested.

Described here is an urban project in which teacher morale is an issue. The schools in this city serve a large number of low-income, welfare-receiving families, and the teacher population is older because of a decade of declining enrollment. Of the many problems at the schools,

teacher morale is one of the most pressing. The Teacher Corps proposal stated that at the high school, "25 to 40% of the students are not in their classes, with Mondays and Fridays the worst days of the week... the teacher absentee rate closely patterns the percentage of student absentees." The proposal author speculated that one of the reasons for this problem may be teacher morale.

> We will probably not be very successful in dealing with the problems that youngsters have in school until we get staff members who are committed so that they, themselves, can assume their responsibilities ... How can teachers who are poorly motivated inspire and motivate poorly motivated students?

The teachers also recognize that their morale is low, as demonstrated in this response to a question regarding the many school problems teachers face:

> The biggest problem is teacher morale. I've been in this system for fourteen years. I've seen the morale of the teachers float out the window. I'd like to see some enthusiasm come back. It's like everyone is tired, drained. You have so many defenses. Parents and administrators are against you. There's so much on top of you.

The teachers reflect these attitudes in their expressed and implied behavior. Their participation (or lack of participation) in the Teacher Corps program indicates how they feel about their role in school activities. The documenter described the negative climate that had developed between school and university personnel because of

> ...the resentment expressed by the school principals on their behalf and their teachers, that they were not paid for participating in planning activities while university faculty were. To some extent this has created an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion about motivation between the university and school district.

Throughout the planning year, the project staff tried to keep communication channels open to all teachers and to plan a summer activity geared to their requests. The long-term effects of open communications during the planning and the effects of the summer experience will be determined as this project moves into its second year. We expect that

those teachers who communicated and participated most in the program will have a higher morale and will disseminate more skills than those who were less involved. The challenge in this project is obviously greater than that in the Ellington School project.

The example demonstrates that teacher morale influences planning and operations at the schools; in fact, morale is an important if not a key factor in the Teacher Corps Program. In the Ellington School example, the project was fortunate in not needing to combat low teacher morale. Other projects are overcoming it, often through communication as well as patience, flexibility, and sensitivity to teachers' needs and skepticism toward outside help.

Cohesive Teaching Staff

Ellington School is unusually small; the 16 teachers and the principal can fairly easily work as a group and communicate informally. Most schools, however--especially secondary schools--are much larger and more compartmentalized, and communication across the entire staff becomes more formal.

If it did not previously exist, cohesiveness can develop through the involvement in Teacher Corps. For example, most projects conducted formal assessments of needs in the schools, often by means of a structured questionnaire distributed to teachers. Teachers usually filled out the questionnaires by themselves or with their friends, turned the forms in, and waited to hear which needs received the most votes. In some projects, however, teachers were brought together in small groups to prevent the needs assessment process from becoming a "wants assessment." One documenter described the positive results of such face-to-face discussions among school faculty members and concluded that:

> Prioritizing needs on the basis of a numerical value arrived at through consensus is generally accepted by the faculty as a fair, democratic decisionmaking procedure, and thus they are more apt to support the results. The process, of course, demands a greater time commitment by all participants. The nominal group process also is

> highly regarded by both faculty and administration as a morale booster because it creates a social atmosphere conducive to more intensive human interaction than is ordinarily the case in the schools. One principal stated that she would like to make the needs-sharing process a permanent feature of faculty activities.

Building teacher cohesiveness was even a planning year objective for one project. That project began soon after a divisive teacher strike, and the Teacher Corps staff believed it needed "to pull the teachers together." The documenter reported that, "some teachers chose to go on strike, others chose not to...teachers returned to school not speaking to each other."

The actual school site appeared to be a negative influence on planning because it had been the scene of hostile encounters between striking and nonstriking teachers. The Teacher Corps staff brought the teachers to the IHE campus, 125 miles away from the school site, to plan a program that the teachers believed they really needed. This tactic appears to have worked. The documenter reported:

> School people had Teacher Corps as something to hold onto. It gave them something to talk to each other about and get away from the feeling of the strike and a chance to interact with the administration. This served as a vehicle for talking about something other than the strike. They had to communicate in order to get organized. They saw the administration in a different light. We saw collaboration on the part of the LEA at the site and the superintendent. Whereas before the administration was viewed as saying, "You can't do that," now they are saying, "That's a good idea."

Once teachers began to communicate freely and have a sense of ownership in the program, group cohesiveness began to develop. Teacher Corps activities "provided a new directional focus for the faculty...a mutual feeling of respect, understanding, cooperation, motivation and communication was noticeable."

Administrators' Support for Planning

The Ellington School principal greatly facilitated the planning process in his school. Although he initially disagreed with the teachers in their choice of inservice training, he did not impose his will on them.

Rather, he supported the teachers' right to identify their own needs and plan their own program. The principal believed that once the teachers' primary needs were satisfied, additional needs would be identified.

Project documentation indicated that prinicpals' support of the project often dictated its success. For example, one project was alarmed at the lack of teacher participation in the project and found that the princiapls had failed to promote inservice participation because they were not involved in the planning. Another documenter summarized the influence of supportive and nonsupportive principals as follows:

> As much recent research indicates, administrators are the "gatekeepers of change" in the schools. Although this administrator gave oral commitment to the project's goals, there was little follow-through and no expectations placed on his staff. As a consequence, the trainer was forced to go "around" the principal and gained considerable success by holding "brown bag" training sessions with voluntary teachers. However, comparing the results with another high school, a target school for the Title IV-C Staff Development project, far greater participation, involvement, and growth were achieved when the principal actively assumed the responsibilities of instructional leader.

Finding Training Resources

The combination of conditions within Ellington School were ripe for setting in motion a teacher-initiated planning process. The development of plans for the field-based training programs, however, required the availability of appropriate training resources either at a nearby IHE or elsewhere. In the case of Ellington School, people capable of delivering the requisite training were located at the nearby teachers' college and at the specialized music institute. The fact that these instructors could be located depended to a large extent on the facts that IHE staff (especially those involved with Teacher Corps) were interested in and aware of the teacher training resources in the area and that the city is rich in such training resources.

The availability of resources was a critical problem for many projects, especially in projects where schools and training institutions were separated by large geographical and cultural distances. As one documenter of a Native American project observed:

> Again, because of our unique situation it was imperative that the program develop an alternative degree program which was field based, interdisciplinary, and cross-cultural in nature. Simply to transplant typical on-campus courses, methodology, and delivery systems to this rural site would not have worked; a new approach which would take into account the students' backgrounds, life-styles, and relationships with schools and communities, and the limitations imposed by transportation and communication networks over long distances was needed. There have been tremendous opportunities for developing relevant, meaningful educational experiences that make use of the interplay between theory and practice in education and among the various disciplines usually kept separate in traditional programs. As much as possible, also, the students' own cultural perspectives have been sought and used to enhance learning.

Characteristics of the Flow of Activities at the School Level

The success of the planning process at Ellington School was attributed not only to the school conditions and availability of training resources, but also to characteristics of the ongoing planning process itself. Teachers assumed responsibility for identifying their own needs, and the incentives for their doing so were varied. All participants in the planning remained flexible throughout the process, as permitted by the Teacher Corps Program mandate. Teachers received training that fit both their definition and the IHE's definition of appropriate "staff development." The resulting program was geared to the particular needs and limitations of Ellington School.

The same characteristics were observed in other school-level planning situations and are summarized below.

Teachers' Assumption of Responsibility for Identifying Their Own Needs

The teachers at Ellington School did not need encouragement in specifying their needs. In fact, they felt strongly enough about the need for a music and physical education program to oppose administrators. In other sites, the teachers and project staff disagreed on goals or the project staff had difficulty in conveying to teachers the need for setting their own goals.

A documenter described how project staff resisted setting goals for the teachers:

> It would be easier for the project staff to develop in-service programs which focus on changing teacher behavior rather than let teachers determine what they need in the way of training. However, we realize this would be perceived as a lay-on and probably would not reap the intended benefits.
>
> I firmly believe that given time and support, the teachers associated with this project will eventually begin to focus on training activities that will cause significant changes in their instructional programs, which will ultimately result in a more effective and positive environment for children.

Incentives for Participation in Teacher Corps

Many projects suggested that the best incentive for teachers to participate in Teacher Corps was to offer a program geared to their needs. The teachers at Ellington School stated during the planning session that they expected the training programs to be useful. The college credits they were to obtain were less of an incentive than the professional growth they expected to experience through the training. Other projects expressed the same sentiment:

> In our project, teachers decided whether they needed inservice, the type of training appropriate, and the times it would be offered...Teachers also gained decision-making power over the inservice agenda... The core of participants in this ongoing inservice activity were those teachers whose interview responses shaped the program.

In other projects, material incentives were a primary concern and teachers were not satisfied with those that were offered. For example, one documenter wrote:

> Policymakers should recognize the need to provide funds for incentives to participants. Just as the policymakers look for the payoff from the projects, participants look to the payoff for themselves. Whether we like it or not, there is a prevailing attitude in the teaching profession of "What's in it for me?" If we want to change that, then we may have to give a little more than we get, at least initially.
>
> In a society with maxims such as "Time is Money" and labor practices such as "overtime," Teacher Corps must face the reality of the market and operate accordingly... perhaps the IHE resource exhaustion and "brain drain" would not be as acute if extra work was remunerated.

A number of projects viewed material incentives as a way of initially attracting reluctant teachers. As a documenter noted, "It doesn't matter what initially brings teachers to inservice activities; what does matter is what happens to them during those activities and how they affect their students."

Although material incentives are a potential means of encouraging professional and personal growth, they must be defined clearly and thoughtfully or else they may be viewed not as a blessing but a curse.

> Clear communication to groups (teachers, aides, parents) of limitations involved in getting university credit and the generation of alternative incentives should be addressed early, often, and consistently. Warning of the dangers of unclear, of inconsistent offerings would be advantageous.

Incentives are important in the planning and implementation of Teacher Corps programs. First-year reports from the field indicate that in some sites material incentives were assessed for their appeal, in and of themselves. Other incentives were broadened interest and improved skills. A different type of incentive existed in some projects, that of learning for its own reward; teachers became involved and found the training personally and professionally enhancing. Where that type of incentive

exists, teachers are more likely to participate in the training regardless of how inconvenient the time and place and regardless of the availability of material incentives.

Flexibility and Patience

As described, the project staff, administrators, and teachers at Ellington School remained flexible throughout the planning process. The project staff did not come to the school with a preestablished program, although it did want to accomplish goals other than training teachers in physical education and music.

Few mandates in the Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations concern the content or direction of inservice training. Only three are listed under school objectives: education that is multicultural, training to deal with a wide range of variability in children, and diagnostic/prescriptive training. If teachers resist training in these areas (and view such predetermined goals as "lay-ons"), projects are free to incorporate these emphases within other training foci (e.g., multicultural education can and should be included in any training in content areas) or to postpone emphasis on these mandated areas until the teachers' initial needs are met. The Rules and Regulations are flexible becuase they do not specify when or how these three school-level objectives should be met.

The Teacher Corps administration and project staff serving Ellington School realized that many of their goals would also be met if they were patient. This was also true in a Program 78 project that received a hostile initial reception from teachers at one school. In that project, the Teacher Corps staff set aside any notion of working with the large school group and focused on the few teachers who were potentially interested. The Teacher Corps staff waited for the time when the small groups of teachers would convince their invited colleagues and together offer support for the program. The documenter reported:

> We are convinced that a more aggressive approach to this school would have resulted in the staff severing ties with

> our project. The payoff for patience is today a strong cadre of teachers who are enthusiastic supporters of Teacher Corps.

Agreement of What Constitutes Appropriate Staff Development

A potential problem at Ellington School was diverted when the district released money for a music program for the children to coincide with the teacher training. This solution forestalled a confrontation over what constitutes appropriate staff development activities. The teachers and instructors at the music institute assumed they would offer a music program for children, while the Teacher Corps project staff assumed they would offer teacher training. The difference in perception is probably attributable to different degrees of exposure to the Teacher Corps mandates and to prior experiences with federal programs. The project staff knew Teacher Corps was a teacher training program and probably assumed the teachers realized that. The teachers, however, were familiar with and accustomed to federal programs in which specialists came into the classroom to teach the children.

Because the Teacher Corps staff and teachers have different experiences with staff development programs, perceptions need to be clarified from the beginning. A documenter from a Youth Advocacy project wrote:

> In organizing and processing the initial conception of staff development with project sites, many questions need to be answered prior to venturing to the field and making commitments to an inservice delivery. Aside from the predisposition of personnel on site and their view of what staff development is, why it is taking place, and who feels it is necessary, it is also imperative to assess the readiness, capability, and flexibility of the institution which will deliver in-service training.

Similarly, another project avoided a possible conflict by recognizing that the teachers' views of staff development involved immediate, short-term interventions, whereas this IHE's views were long range and research oriented. In this project, negotiations took place.

> The university faculty agreed to help fulfill some short-term goals in exchange for the promise to conduct studies.... We advocate that agreements between university and school personnel be written in minutes of their meetings so that each has a clear idea of what is expected...a blueprint for future activities.

These examples emphasize that all participants must be sure they understand each others' definition of staff development so that they can work toward a mutually agreeable training process. Professors and the teacher recipients will regard staff development programs differently. In the examples cited, IHE staff and teachers did not approach early planning with the same definition of what constitutes staff development, although compromises were reached. Other projects may never have realized that some of their problems in the schools may have been the result of different concepts of appropriate staff development.

Inservice Training Geared to the School Environment

The inservice program at Ellington School was geared to the specific environment of that school. It met the teachers' and children's needs and was desiged within the physical limitations of the school. During the planning year, Ellington School was treated as a self-contained unit, with its own strengths and limitations. The addition of teachers from other schools into this carefully planned and environmentally sensitive program almost ruined the inservice program.

In another project, too, the conditions at one project school distinguished it from the other schools. The elementary school teachers had just moved to a new building when Teacher Corps project began and they were suffering the residual inconveniences of the move. The documenter described how this situation was handled:

> The pervasiveness of an overworked feeling among the elementary school staff and the serious nature of teacher complaints gave clear direction to planning by the Teacher Corps staff. It was clear that more structured, small-group informational meetings, like those being held at the two secondary schools, would have made too many additional demands on time and energy on the elementary school staff

> at that time. Consequently, the Teacher Corps staff planned and held an informal social event in recognition of the entire school staff at a comfortable location away from the school site. One teacher stated, "This occurred just at the right time." Comments such as these plus the enthusiastic response of the staff to the invitation and the large attendance indicated that the meeting was a highly appropriate and appreciated one. This specific example illustrates the essential sequence of having planning time to develop interpersonal relationships. Strong trust relations facilitate communication about school climate and in turn result in appropriate implementation activities.

Many other projects, however, have followed the mandate in the Rules and Regulations that all project schools jointly participate in developing objectives, and they have been pleased with the results. For example, one project in the case study sample sponsored a summer program planned jointly by teachers at all project schools, community people, and IHE representatives. The summer program had two foci--teachers teaching students in the morning and trainers offering inservice classes for teachers in the afternoon. Teachers from elementary, middle, and high schools participated, and some experimented with teaching at grade levels other than those they taught during the regular school year. This provided an opportunity for teachers to learn about the needs of other students and teachers.

The staff's reactions to the summer experience were positive for the most part:

> Most of us have enjoyed having the three feeder schools together and teachers sharing ideas. During the regular school year, we're wrapped up in our own school work.

In sum, inservice training must be sensitive to the environment in which it is offered. In some cases, programs must treat each school's needs independently; the most pressing problems are unique to a specific school. In other cases, teachers benefit from interactions with teachers from other schools. The data suggest that projects should be free to choose whether to focus planning on school-specific needs or on needs of the feeder system.

The Value of the Planning Year for Involving Personnel in Project Development

One of the strongest messages received from the case studies and project documentation so far has been that actively involving school personnel in program development takes extended time. Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations have tried to ensure active involvement by requiring that projects spend the first year in a planning process involving all relevant participants. As the Ellington School project demonstrated, that process did not end when the planning year was over but carried on with increasing momentum as the teachers became more actively committed to the inservice program they had developed for themselves. The foundation for the process, however, was laid during the planning year.

Other projects described how during the planning year they laid a foundation for active teacher involvement. Even in projects with prior Teacher Corps experience, the planning year facilitated entrance into new project schools. A Program 78 documenter wrote:

> Starting a five-year project was very different from the previous projects. We have three schools, rather than one, with two of the schools new to Teacher Corps ideas and activities. The teachers in the new schools needed time to discuss, question, propose activities, and interact with others involved in the planning process. While frustrating to some participants, the "brain-storming" sessions without predetermined outcomes helped to develop a sense of "ownership" for the plans which emerged from the planning task forces.

Many project documenters mentioned that teachers did not know how to plan. Before Teacher Corps, they had been the recipients, not the instigators, of inservice programs. As one documenter described, planning committees often spent their first sessions helping the teachers to articulate needs:

> ...each of the basic Teacher Corps outcomes...requires substantial planning. In our case, the LEA has had no development system and school professional development activities, even though the LEA contract with its teacher union specifies

internal budget allocations for such activities. Thus, planning includes time consuming awareness and interest-building.

Some projects used the planning year to offer courses on how to plan and were pleased with the results:

> The planning courses being conducted at the four project schools are currently the inservice component. The teachers involved appear to see this as a unique opportunity to have firsthand input into "the system." In this era of declining enrollment, reduction in force of teaching staffs, school closing and consolidations, and citizen outcries to "cut down on school costs," it is unusual and refreshing to see teachers actively and enthusiastically planning implementation strategies to open "new" (in this case, reconditioned and rehabilitated) facilities. At each school site, the courses entitled "Developing an Education Plan" are enabling the university, Teacher Corps staff, and Public Schools personnel to focus on issues determined by the teachers.

Some projects commented that an entire year may be longer than necessary because teachers were eager to begin the proposed classes and did not understand why they had to wait until the next school year. Most projects, however, appreciated the planning year and the time that it gave them to involve school personnel in developing school-level project activities.